

1765. By Mr. WALTER: Petition regarding House bill 1012; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1766. By Mr. WELCH: Tabulated record of sentiments of representative group of citizens of Salinas, Calif., regarding the Japanese situation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1767. Also, petition of the County Supervisors Association of California, adopted June 18, 1943, regarding the Japanese situation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1768. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petition of the Reciprocity Club, affiliate of Cincinnati Club, Cincinnati, Ohio, signed by 39 residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1769. Also, petition of Herbert Hoffheimer and signed by 19 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1770. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Labor Council, adopted June 19, 1943, supporting the action taken by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors requesting that priorities be granted for the construction of 5,000 moderately priced family dwellings for war workers within the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1771. Also, resolution of the San Francisco building and construction trades council, relative to increasing dependency allotments to aged mothers and fathers of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1772. Also, resolution of the Berkeley Lodge, No. 1002, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, commending Gen. John L. DeWitt for the efficient manner in which he conducted the registration and removal of persons of Japanese descent to relocation centers and the courageous stand he has taken in all matters connected therewith, and opposing any action toward the release of native-born Japanese from the relocation centers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1773. Also, resolution of the County Supervisors Association of California, Sacramento, Calif., expressing appreciation of the services of Gen. John L. DeWitt and their confidence in his leadership, and urging those in authority to approve the acts and orders of General DeWitt, particularly in reference to the evacuation of the Japanese people, and to continue General DeWitt in charge of the Western Defense area; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1774. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Atlantic States Shippers Advisory Board, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to additional governmental agencies for the purposes of regulating, controlling, or developing transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

mend its flaws and make it the fit instrument of Thy will in these troubled days. Forgive us that so often drunk with sight of power we have loosed wild tongues that have not Thee in awe.

History's tragic pages remind us that Thy providence knows no favorites, that naught can bend Thy justice and none can break Thy laws that shall not themselves be broken. Facing duties and decisions that outweigh our own strength and our own wisdom, we ask for courage to do the right as Thou dost give us to see the right. More potent than the raucous voices without may there come the whisper of a still voice within, heard only by obedient hearts:

"Men may misjudge thy aim,
Think they have cause for blame,
Say thou art wrong.
Hold on thy quiet way;
God is the judge—not they.
Fear not, be strong."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, June 28, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hatch	Pepper
Andrews	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Evercomb
Barkley	Holman	Reynolds
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Bone	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scruggs
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdoch	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gurney	Overton	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr.

CLARK] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATION OF ARMOND W. SCOTT TO BE ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of July 7, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Armond W. Scott, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations to the committee.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATION OF THOMAS D. QUINN TO BE ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of July 7, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Thomas D. Quinn, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations to the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

COSTS, CANCELLATIONS, AND MISCELLANEOUS DATA OF INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of costs, cancellations, and miscellaneous irrigation data of Indian irrigation projects for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

LAND ACQUISITIONS BY THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who countest the nations as the dust of the balance, who puttest down the mighty from their seat and exalteth the humble and the meek, have mercy upon our Nation as we strive to

all acquisitions of land by lease or otherwise effected pursuant to Public Law 1, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 1, first session, authorizing appropriations for the Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended January 31, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

OPERATIONS UNDER SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION (S. Doc. No. 87)

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth report on the operations of the Chairman of the War Production Board under authority of the act approved June 11, 1942 (Public Law 603, 77th Cong.) relating to the activities of the Smaller War Plants Corporation (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS AND APPLIANCES FOR RETIRED OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE ARMY, NAVY, ETC.

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to regulate the furnishing of artificial limbs or other appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps or Coast Guard, and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (2) and Navy (3); the National Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Federal Security Agency, and the United States Maritime Commission which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Illinois Legislature; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

"House Joint Resolution 50

"Whereas recent authoritative statements of officials of the Federal Government have indicated an intention to augment the national military forces to a number upward of 10,000,000; and a large proportion of these persons will be disfranchised, in effect, in national elections unless some method is devised to facilitate their voting; and, in 1944, the President, Vice President, and one-third of the Senate will be elected to govern this Nation during the period of utmost stress and possibly at the time when terms of peace are being considered; and refusal to grant a voice in national matters to such a substantial part of the electorate may engender a spirit of ill-will and be detrimental to national unity: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of

the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein). That we respectfully request the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to afford a reasonable opportunity to every member of the military forces of the United States to cast a ballot in national elections, at least insofar as candidates will be voted for by an entire State; and that a copy of this preamble and resolution be delivered by the secretary of state to the presiding officer of each House of Congress and to each Member of Congress from Illinois."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution adopted by members of the Kansas Conference of the Methodist Church assembled at the annual Summer School of Theology, Baldwin, Kans., favoring repeal of the so-called Oriental Exclusion Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE SUBSIDY AND ROLL-BACK PROGRAM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the Record at this point three typical letters from citizens of Kansas, two of them farmers, the other from a physician in a small town in the general farming region of the State, stating their views in opposition to the roll-back and food subsidy program.

I can state to the Senate that I believe these short letters express the overwhelming sentiment of the farmers of Kansas, and the majority of the entire citizenship of Kansas. Kansas does not believe in the roll-back and subsidy plan and does not want it. May I express the hope that the conferees will stand firm for the position taken by both branches of Congress in prohibiting subsidies except for the purpose of obtaining maximum production of farm products and critical materials, along the lines of the Aiken-Gillette (Senate) and Wolcott (House) amendments to the bill extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation another 2 years.

I send the letters to the desk for printing in the Record as part of my remarks at this point. Also a telegram from the Excel Packing Co. of Wichita, Kans.

I also ask that the letters and telegram be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letters and telegram were received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ESKRIDGE, KANS., June 17, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The farmers of our community want no subsidy. That is final.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. WALKER, M. D.

GARDEN CITY, KANS., June 14, 1943.

DEAR SENATORS CAPPER, REED, AND REPRESENTATIVE CLIFFORD R. HOPE: I want to raise my voice again against this subsidy idea that the administration is trying to put upon us folks. It is just cheap politics to buy the labor vote, and, besides, the processors have already taken from \$1 to \$1.50 off livestock. Besides, labor is getting wages above what we farmers are being paid.

Labor at \$1.05 to \$1.50 per hour is more than wheat at \$1.22, or cattle at \$15, or sheep at \$7.50, lamb at \$15.75, or hogs at \$13.50.

Yours truly,

R. T. PLUMMER.

SOLOMON, KANS., June 20, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been thinking about writing you a letter for the last 3 months

and finally got to it. Things are getting so rotten that we farmers will have to raise hell yet before this thing is over. It looks like they are trying to make saps out of the farmers. I think it is time for Congress to take over and give us some common-sense legislation; that is all that this country needs. I have talked to a lot of farmers in this part of the country, and the most of them feel the same as I do about it. I think that 90 percent of the farmers are against subsidy of any kind, and they all think that wheat should be at least \$1.50 to \$1.75 a bushel, which would be in line with other things. I would like to know why they didn't let the wheat farmer vote this spring. Will you please let me know? Now you boys get together down there and put the screws on all of that foolishness, and we will win this war in a lot less time and feel a lot better about it.

Yours truly,

R. C. HEIDRICK.

WICHITA, KANS., June 24, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Earnestly request your support of legislation killing roll-back on meat products. Cannot save average consumer over \$2.40 per annum and, therefore, is without effect on inflation. Please make sure that both roll-back and subsidy are killed, because it would be ruinous to kill subsidy without killing roll-back. Legislation needed to save whole industry from chaos and insure supply of meat to armed forces and civilians.

EXCEL PACKING CO.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, this morning a group of sincere, public-spirited women came to my office, and presented to me petitions signed by approximately 1,500 citizens of Pennsylvania. The signatories of these petitions are one in requesting that definite action be taken by the Congress to control the liquor traffic in all strategic military areas throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present the petitions and that one of the petitions be inserted in the Record without all the signatures attached thereto as a part of my remarks, and that they be referred to the Military Affairs Committee, in order that the members of that committee may become familiar with the mounting concern with which the problem of liquor control is being viewed by great numbers of serious and progressive citizens in the State of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the Record without all the signatures attached, as follows:

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States of America, do earnestly petition the Senate of the United States of America to pass the bill (S. 860) for the moral and physical welfare of our armed forces in the great defense emergency of the present time, and the urgent need for victory in the total war the world is embroiled in now.

ELIZABETH HELLER.

LEO P. TERRY.

HARRY W. LANGENBERG.

(And numerous other citizens, all in the State of Pennsylvania.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Mines and Mining:

S. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; without amendments (Rept. No. 364).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

S. 1252. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects; with an amendment (Rept. No. 365); and

S. 1257. A bill authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 366).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. LUCAS) introduced Senate bill 1285, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1286. A bill to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943; to the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 1287, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1288. A bill for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1289. A bill to provide for improved agricultural land utilization by assisting in the rehabilitation and construction of drainage works in the humid areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SPECIAL METHOD OF VOTING IN TIME OF WAR

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and I have joined in introducing a bill providing a special method of voting in time of war. It will be remembered that last September a bill which I had introduced to provide a method of voting in time of war by members of the land and naval forces absent from their places of residence was enacted into law. The time was short before the election, the provisions of the law were not generally known, and its provisions were carried out only in part.

Our experience with that law in the last election made evident the fact that it could be greatly improved, and the bill now introduced by the Senator from Illinois and myself is intended to accomplish that end. The Senator from Illinois, by reason of his familiarity with the laws of his State of Illinois, and study of the election returns from the land and naval forces in the last November election, has formulated ideas which are of great service in improving the existing law. He has laid emphasis on the fact that it is important not only to legislate to give the men and women in the armed service the vote, but to make sure that such legislation is enforced, regardless of where they are.

It is most desirable that no man or women eligible to vote should be deprived of what is the greatest privilege of the American citizen, that is, having a share in determining through his elected representatives the future policies of his Government. At this period of the world's history, that is the most notable difference between this land of freedom and the totalitarian countries which are attempting to destroy us.

Therefore, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to accomplish the purpose indicated and request that it be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1255) to amend the act of September 11, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

INCREASES IN SALARIES, COMPENSATION, PENSIONS, ETC., TO MEET INCREASED LIVING COSTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the clerk's desk a bill to provide for increases in the rates of payments of salaries, compensation, pension, retirement benefits, social-security benefits, and other monetary benefits not based on specific contracts by 10 percent of the basic amounts thereof for each 10-percent increase in the cost of living, as compared with the index figure of the cost of living during the first half of 1940, to be computed for each 6-month period following enactment, to be put into effect, prospectively, as of the first of the fourth month after each such 6-month period, and for other purposes.

The enactment of such legislation at this time would, in my opinion, settle once and for all the various proposals for increases for this or that group of governmental employees or Federal beneficiaries.

It will be noted that the proposed 10-percent increase in all payments of Federal salaries, compensation, pension, retirement benefits, and social-security benefits, would apply equally as to all groups of Federal employees and Federal beneficiaries at the same time. This proposed legislation would provide for a 10-percent increase in all such monthly payments for each 10-percent increase in the cost of living over the basic cost during the first half of 1940, to be computed each 6 months, and then to be put into effect as of the first of the fourth month thereafter, so that it would be administratively feasible with very little auditing or clerical difficulty.

This proposed legislation would be fair both to governmental employees and beneficiaries on the one hand, and to the Government on the other hand, in that if the cost of living should undergo a decrease, to such extent as not to support a previous 10-percent increase in such payments, the same would be decreased by 10 percent, provided, however, that there should be no decrease under the basic amounts provided for by law.

The enactment of this proposed legislation would almost automatically do away with the necessity for any proposals for basic increases for any other special groups, except to correct gross inequalities, as to the basic amounts provided for.

If such legislation were enacted as to governmental employees and beneficiaries, then it is quite likely that labor unions would request addendums to their present wage contracts to provide for a similar formula as to future wage increases. Once such a formula were in effect as to governmental salaries and benefit payments, and then as to labor union contracts, every segment of society would realize the futility of attempting to secure a temporary advance by any increase in prices for any special commodities, for such temporary advance would probably shortly be canceled by reason of the operation of such 10-percent increase or decrease formula for adjusting salaries and benefit payments. I believe that the adoption of this formula would be eminently fair for all groups of governmental employees and beneficiaries and would in the final analysis prove to be a greater stabilizer as to the purchasing power of wages, salaries, compensation, pension, retirement benefits, and social-security benefits than any other formula which could be realized.

I sincerely hope that early and serious consideration will be given by the committee to which this bill may be referred, to the end that the bill may speedily be reported back to the Senate floor for the consideration of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill at this time for appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1287) to provide for increases in the rates of payments of salaries, compensation, pension, retirement benefits, social security benefits, and other monetary benefits not based on specific contracts by 10 percent of the basic amounts thereof for each 10-percent increase in the cost of living, as compared with the index figure of the cost of living during the first half of 1940, to be computed for each 6-month period following enactment, to be put into effect, prospectively, as of the 1st of the fourth month after each such 6-month period, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LODGE submitted to following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

On page 8, line 8, strike out "\$5,473,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$31,032,970, of which \$25,559,970 shall be available to the Administrator for carrying out any govern-

mental program heretofore or hereinafter initiated with respect to the rationing of petroleum and petroleum products; and all authority heretofore conferred upon the Office of Price Administration and the Price Administrator with respect to such rationing is hereby transferred to the Petroleum Administration for War and the Petroleum Administrator for War, respectively."

On page 10, line 6, strike out "\$177,335,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$151,775,030."

Mr. LODGE also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION — RESIGNATION AND APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the Chair was kind enough to appoint me one of the conferees on the part of the Senate to participate in the conference on the items in difference between the House and the Senate on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes. I am at such variance with the action the Senate took with reference to the bill that I desire to be relieved from service as a member of the conference; and I ask the Chair to appoint some other Member of the Senate in my place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair accepts the resignation of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and appoints in his stead the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE].

RECOMMITTAL OF NOMINATION OF POSTMASTER AT MARLETTE, MICH.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to make a request of the Senator from Tennessee in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. Yesterday, inadvertently, I informally passed over the nomination of John S. Dunsford to be postmaster at Marlette, Mich., among many others. Normally, I have not interfered with the Democratic Party machinery in connection with postmasters under the existing political regime. But this happens to be a case in which I have filed a protest with the committee, and I now renew it. It is a case in which a veteran of World War No. 1 has a prior standing in the postal civil-service examination, and members of the American Legion feel that their highly eligible comrade has been prejudicially kept from this appointment solely for political reasons, solely because he does not belong to the prevailing political party.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the nomination on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is. What I am asking the Senator is if he will allow me to ask, as in executive session, that the nomination be recommitted to the committee in order to investigate whether Mr. Harold Doyle, a veteran of

World War No. 1, has been prejudicially dealt with in this case, on the basis of sheer partisan patronage.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As in executive session I make that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, it is so ordered.

CORRECTION OF STATEMENT IN PRESS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in New York on Sunday last, I spoke at the national meeting of the Eastern Seaboard Substitutes Conference sponsored by the Affiliated Postal Employees.

Unfortunately, it was the hottest day of the year, with the result that a statement that I made was either made inadvertently by me, or the press, which was unusually friendly, got one too many zeros to some figures I quoted.

I stated in the course of my patriotic speech that—

Great as this country is, magnificent as its record has been, proud as we are of the accomplishments of its people, there is still much to be done. The Federal statistics show 3,200,000 suffering from venereal diseases, 1,200,000 war workers who are being treated for syphilis and gonorrhea, and 695,000 young men who were physically fit but were unable to get into the United States forces because of lack of education. Seventy-five thousand young men of draft age are holding down swivel-chair jobs instead of being in the armed forces where they belong, and there are of course the usual rumors that some are of rather wealthy parentage or from families of influence. This is the situation the common people who love their country are called upon in my opinion to remedy, and as I proceed we will discuss what the common people should do politically.

Mr. President, in reporting my remarks, inadvertently the figure was given in the press as 750,000. The figure should have been 75,000. I wish to make that correction.

PREVENTION OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—EDITORIAL FROM THE INDEPENDENCE (KANS.) DAILY REPORTER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "A Salute to Congress," published in the Independence (Kans.) Daily Reporter, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRE-WAR AND POST-WAR POSITIONS OF SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article from the Rutherfordton (N. C.) News, of June 24, 1943, containing a reply by him to an editorial in the June 3 issue of the News, with regard to his pre-war and post-war positions, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. WOLL STATES HIS POSITION—LETTER IN THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter written by Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, to the editor of the New York Times, published in the New York Times for June 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate adopt the conference report on House bill 2714.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the conference report on House bill 2714 been placed before the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. It has been placed before the Senate, but it seems that no motion has been made formally to adopt the report, and I now make that motion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is that the conference report on the urgent deficiency bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say that the Record indicates that the report has not been formally taken up for consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the report be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) "making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes."

(For conference report, see page 6647, Record of June 23, 1943.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to make a point of order against the conference report on the ground that the conferees exceeded their authority in that the amendment in its present form is plainly legislation. The provision as it passed the House, while it had a legislative intent, unquestionably was in form a limitation, but the conferees have gone clear beyond the differences between the two Houses submitted to them, and have written into the conference report affirmative legislation requiring officers to be confirmed by the Senate for whom confirmation is not now required. I therefore suggest, Mr. President, inasmuch as the conferees have gone completely beyond the differences committed to them, that they have exceeded their authority, and that the conference report is subject to a point of order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have only academic interest in this question, but I think as a parliamentary situation the able Senator from Missouri is in error. Therefore I rise without having any interest in the subject matter whatsoever, to discuss it from the standpoint of the rules of the Senate. As I recall, the House conferees inserted legislative language in the bill. That language came to the Senate. There was no modification of that language, or at least no part of it modified. Therefore it gave the conferees a wide range of operation. For that reason I think the conferees could make in the language which was written into the bill by the House any modification they saw fit to make.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The language on page 48, line 19, reads as follows:

No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this Act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made.

If the Senator will look at that language he will find that clearly it is legislation, and therefore, the House having entered the field of legislation, in my judgment the action of the conferees is perfectly proper and legitimate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I recall as though it were yesterday, when the Vice President's seat was occupied by Vice President Garner, and the question arose how far the Senate conferees might properly go when legislative language was inserted in a House appropriation bill. The Vice President held they could go the full length; that they could explore the whole field, and write entirely new language. I understand from this report—and I must confess that I am somewhat lame in my knowledge of the language—that the proposal is to require confirmation of three persons.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. The able Senator from Missouri is striking at it because he believes the conferees have exceeded their authority. I think confirmation by the Senate is quite within the language that is contained in the House bill, and certainly it came within the jurisdiction of the Senate conferees to enter that field and write into the bill such language as conformed to the general purposes which were recited in the House language.

That is a very brief statement, and I say to the Vice President and Members of the Senate, that the matter came up unexpectedly, but a parliamentary question is always an interesting one. For that reason, for what it is worth, I am giving the Chair my views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] yesterday informed the Chair that he would make this point of order. The Chair has had the matter looked into, and makes the following statement with regard to it.

The bill, as passed by the House, prohibiting the use of funds for the payment of salaries of the individuals named, contains this provision:

No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morris Lovett.

The insertion of the language "which is now, or which is hereafter made available under or pursuant to any other act," under the precedents both of the Senate and the House, removes the provision from the category of a limitation and invests it with a legislative character.

The precedents of both bodies are practically unanimous that conferees, in adjusting differences existing between the two Houses on legislation, may make ger-

mane modifications of the matters in disagreement. In the present case the Senate struck out the section of the bill without inserting any provision in lieu thereof; therefore, the conferees, not being bound by any restrictive language on the part of the Senate, have wider power to deal with the provision and may make any germane modification of the House language. The Chair thinks that the language adopted by the conferees certainly is germane and relates directly to the matter in dispute, and is clearly within the limits of power granted to conferees in such cases. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order, and cites in connection therewith section 3288 on pages 774 and 775 of Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall not argue the case, because I think every Member of the Senate knows exactly what he wants to do about the conference report. I merely wish to say that we have had a very difficult time with it. The last report was overruled by quite a large vote. A further conference was requested, and held, and the present report is the result of that conference. Under it, until November 15, the men will remain in office, and if the President should then reappoint them and the Senate confirm them, they would continue to hold their places. Otherwise they would lose their places on the 15th of November. I think such a solution is very satisfactory. It seems to me that if the 3 men have no such subversive views as have been alleged, this body will give them a fair deal. Furthermore, 5,500 employees in the District of Columbia, and others elsewhere throughout the country, perhaps scores of thousands of them all over the country are now awaiting their salaries or increases of salaries, and unless they receive them through this bill they will not get them. In other words, the bill is being held up for the benefit of 3 men.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not think any public purpose is to be served by any undue delay and a restatement of the arguments which heretofore have been made in this body. This matter has been before the Senate on two previous occasions, and the Senate by overwhelmingly decisive votes has decided against any such blackjack procedure as that proposed by the House provision. The first time the Senate voted on the matter it voted 69 to 0 to strike out the House provision. The second time the Senate took the very unusual course of defeating a conference report by a vote of 52 to 17. It seems to me the Senate could not possibly have expressed itself in any more vigorous fashion than was done on those two occasions.

Mr. President, the present conference report contains every objectionable feature, except in matter of degree, which was contained in the original procedure provided by the House bill. The procedure of separating these men from the Federal service on November 15, unless they shall previously have been nominated and confirmed by the Senate, always subject to delay, of course, on a

star chamber proceeding before the subcommittee in the House, is only one step in degree less offensive than the original House provision, and it is fully as objectionable on every question of principle. It seems to me that the Senate, as a matter of self-respect, as a matter of devotion to our constitutional form of government, should reject the conference report and send it back to conference.

No one likes to be responsible for delay in enacting an important appropriation bill, particularly one providing for paying the salaries to which certain persons are entitled; but I submit that if the House of Representatives adheres to the course it has been pursuing, it will be its responsibility, and it will have to face the country and take the responsibility, and it will have to face the country and take the responsibility for that course.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on last Thursday a conference report on this same bill was submitted to the Senate, and was rejected by a vote of 52 to 17. The report was rejected and sent back to conference upon two grounds: First, there would be unfair treatment of three employees of the Government under the bill as then reported; second—and a much more important reason, in my opinion—there had been defeated in conference a provision restricting the use of an emergency fund given into the hands of the President. The bill extended the former appropriations, and increased them by \$25,000,000, giving the President a total fund of \$94,000,000. The Senate wrote into the bill, with respect to the use of that fund, a provision that no part of the fund should be used by the Chief Executive for any agency or for any purpose for which the Congress had refused to make an appropriation.

That provision has been deleted in conference. We have now twice discussed this action of the conference and we have already repudiated the action taken in conference. The Senate now is again asked to surrender its position on this question. We now are asked to abandon the position we took on the first consideration of this bill, and which we took again last Thursday. We are asked to say that the money we have appropriated may be used by the Chief Executive, in effect, to finance some project or some agency for which an appropriation has been refused by the Congress.

To me, that subject is much more serious than a delay in the payment of some salaries; it is more serious in its effect on the country than any rights of any three employees of the Government. Unless we reject this conference report again and write this restrictive provision back into the bill, the President may, if he desires, defeat the intent and purposes of Congress by financing some project from this fund in instances where Congress has refused to appropriate money for such a project.

For that reason, I urge upon this body that the report be rejected, and that we adhere to our position that the limitation be placed upon the funds, as we previously decided should be done, and as we

so decided a second time last Thursday. I hope the conference report will be rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I realize nothing is to be gained by further debate, but I desire the RECORD to show that I am as much opposed to the conference report in its present form as I was when it was previously submitted, and I think the Senate should reject it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, my justification for taking any time at all now is that I was not present when the bill was passed originally, at which time the Senate unanimously eliminated the offensive House provision with regard to the three men involved, and I was not present when the conference report was rejected a few days ago. If I had been present on both those occasions I would have voted to eliminate that offensive provision of the House bill, and I would have voted to reject the conference report.

It seems almost incredible, Mr. President, that any legislative body would resort to the tyrannical method which is involved in this provision. I do not know these men. So far as I know, I have never met any of them. If their names were sent to the Senate for confirmation, I do not know that I would vote to confirm the nomination of any one of them. However, I do not foreclose myself in regard to that question, if their names should ever be sent to the Senate. But among all the 2,000,000 employees of the United States—if there are that many, and I presume there are approximately that many, in view of the war situation—

Mr. VANDENBERG. There are 3,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood the figure was 2,000,000. If it is 3,000,000, it further emphasizes my point.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It will be 4,000,000 next week. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Among the 3,000,000 employees of the United States, the Congress of the United States is so afraid of three men because of what they may think or what they may have said, or what they may have quoted somebody else as saying, that it is apprehensive the Government of the United States will collapse unless those men are separated from the pay roll.

I made a brief argument on this question at the last session, when the House had done the same thing in regard to two of these men. I feel that such action by any legislative body outrages all the principles of fair play and democracy, as we think we are now fighting to preserve it in the world.

These men were not given an opportunity to be heard by the House committee. I do not know that they wanted to be heard before the Senate committee, because the Senate committee promptly struck out the language, and it probably was not necessary to hear them. But, regardless of that, I think it would have been an act of fair play to the men to have heard them before some committee. Even the hearings which were had in the other body were not permitted to be made public. The men involved were not even permitted to see

them. They do not know yet what anybody said about them that resulted in this legislative assassination.

The so-called compromise simply provides that instead of cutting their heads off day after tomorrow, we are to cut them off on the 15th of November and bring them in on a platter as a Christmas gift to Herod. We are going to give them a slow death instead of decapitating them at once.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to yield. Mr. McKELLAR. If these men are the kind of men the Senator says they are, good American citizens—and I am not challenging them at all—

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not said anything about the men. I have not said that they are good American citizens. I do not know. I assume, in the absence of any proof to the contrary, that they would be regarded as good American citizens.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a great deal of proof to the contrary, let me say to the Senator. Such proof was offered before our committee, and also before the House committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. It ought to be made public.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is available to the Senator. He can send for it any time he wishes to see it.

That is not the question. The question now is, Are we to hold up the salaries of hundreds of thousands of other Government employees against whom there is no charge of any kind, merely to oppose a procedure which we think is incorrect? I agree that this is not the proper way to discharge men in the public service. I have said so time and again. The fact is that there is a precedent for it, because last year or the year before we did the same thing in the case of a man by the name of Lassar, and the Senate agreed to it. I remember the name and the case, but I do not remember what the charges were.

The House has voted 5 to 1. It was on my motion that the Senate refused previously to agree to the House provision; but we face a very peculiar situation. We passed a measure increasing the salaries of hundreds of thousands of Government employees, 5,500 of whom are in the District of Columbia. We cannot pay the increased amounts to employees against whom nothing has been said. We cannot pay them, forsooth, because the House takes the unalterable position that these three men ought to be fairly dealt with in some way. A fair way of dealing with them has been provided. I would not say that the Senate would not treat them fairly. I would not say that if the cases of these three men were submitted to the Senate, it would be equivalent to throwing their heads to Herod. I do not think that is a fair statement of the case.

If we want to pass this bill so that hundreds of thousands of honest, honorable, hard-working employees may receive the increases in salary which have been awarded to them by the Congress, we will vote for the conference report.

If the Senate wishes to vote the other way, that is a matter for the Senate. I am not asking any Senator how he will vote. So far as I am concerned, he may vote exactly as he pleases. I think that is what Senators will do anyway. It seems to me that we had better have a vote and get through with it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the desire for haste in voting, but I did not have an opportunity to express my views on this type of legislation when the bill was previously before the Senate. I rise at this time to express my views, and I shall continue until I conclude.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have not discussed this matter at any time it has been before the Senate. I have always voted against this type of procedure. Does not the argument made by the Senator from Tennessee prove how vicious it is to attach legislative provisions to an appropriation bill? If the Senate concurs in this report today, it will do so simply because it is forced to take such action in order to pay other employees.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is undoubtedly true. The truth of the matter is that under the rules of the House if any Member of the House had risen in his place and made the point of order against this provision because it was legislation on an appropriation bill, it would have been eliminated. No Member of the House made the point of order, and the provision remained in the bill.

I am not urging any Senator to vote against the conference report. The Senate may do as it pleases with it. I realize the difficulty with which the Senator from Tennessee has been confronted. It is unfortunate that we must vote with a pistol held at our heads, because tomorrow at midnight the fiscal year ends and a new one begins. I certainly would regret to see any worthy employee of the Government denied pay for one day because we are forced into a situation in which we must stand by our deep convictions as to the viciousness of the proposed legislation or surrender our convictions in order that Government employees may not go without their pay. I am satisfied that they would not go without their pay anyway, because they would not be paid until the 15th of July and I am satisfied that before that time the matter could be adjusted.

I wish to express my profound disagreement with this character of legislation. If we can do such a thing with regard to these three men, we can do it with regard to any other employee of the United States. We could deny an appropriation to pay the salary of the Chief Justice of the United States if we did not like some decision which he rendered, in order to get rid of him. That certainly is a vicious way to legislate. In my judgment the provision is just as unconstitutional in the form in which it is now offered as it was in its original form.

Two months ago we dedicated to Thomas Jefferson a very beautiful monument in the District of Columbia. If

Senators will go there they will see in the circular frieze above his statue the most sublime sentence that ever fell from the lips or pen of a mortal man. We might do well to keep that sentence in mind dealing with this subject. This is it:

I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

What is sought to be imposed upon the minds of these three men is a form of tyranny. I regret the necessity of expressing my dissent from the principle involved in this proposal. I regret what seems to me to have been the impetuosity of the other branch of the legislature in passing this bill of attainder. I so thoroughly disagree with the principle that I cannot refrain from expressing my views in regard to it. In spite of the action which has been taken on this matter, if the Senate feels, under the circumstances, that it should adopt the conference report, I shall not say anything about it. It is up to the Senate. I desired to place my views before the Senate, and in the Record, because they have been my views all along, and they are no less my views now because the execution has been postponed until the 15th of November. Of course, it is true that if the President should send the nominations of these three men to the Senate for confirmation and they should be confirmed, the men would continue to be employees of the United States. I do not think that would change the principle upon which we are now being called upon to pass. Regardless of how the Senate may vote on the conference report, my views as to the viciousness of the principle involved in the proposed legislation will not be altered.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

MR. LANGER, and **MR. CLARK** of Missouri asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

MR. MEAD. Mr. President, as one deeply interested in Federal employees, having manifested my interest on many occasions, I regret the delay in the vote on the conference report. However, on this particular issue the Senate has spoken emphatically and decisively. When the Senate spoke it had in mind that the principle underlying this issue was deeper than the question of the removal of three men.

Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee and of the full committee of the Senate which had the opportunity to consider this question, I wish to say that I could never subscribe to the procedure which has been adopted. I am being called upon to pass judgment—execution, if you will—upon three men who never had an opportunity to come before our subcommittee, who never had an opportunity to plead their case before our full committee, and who have never had an opportunity to appear before the subcommittee or the full committee of the other House. I have heard a great deal about military secrets, and about the necessity of keeping them in order that we might take advantage of the enemy, or, rather, in order that the

enemy might not take advantage of us. But why, in the name of God, must we adopt a legislative secret in order to separate three men from the Government pay roll? Why not bring the issue out in the open?

MR. PRESIDENT, this is a democracy, and free speech is one of the underlying principles of democracy. Free speech is not yet dead, and in my judgment we are about to determine in the Senate that it is very much alive.

MR. PRESIDENT, this question can be settled today. We can send the bill back to conference, and the conferees can submit another report before the day is over. If that procedure cannot be followed, another deficiency bill is en route, and we can put in that deficiency bill a pay item pertaining to Federal employees. We are not called upon to pass judgment upon these three men at this time; and we should not do so until we hear the testimony and proceed in the American way.

MR. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I say that it is true, as the Senator from New York has suggested, that a pay provision could be put in the forthcoming deficiency bill, regardless of the three men. However, the House conferees stated that a similar provision with respect to the three men would be attached to that bill. That would result not only in a failure to enact the provisions of this bill, but also a failure to enact the other deficiency bill. In other words, the House conferees stated that they would stand right where they were. It is merely a question of whether we want to stand where we are and not have any bill.

MR. MEAD. Mr. President, we are not responsible for the unreasonableness of anyone but ourselves.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

MR. REVERCOMB. To vote "yea" is to vote to agree to the report, is it not?

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

MR. BRIDGES (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and let my vote stand.

MR. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

MR. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is detained in a meeting of the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises. I am advised that if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—31

Andrews	Holman	Reed
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Bilbo	Lodge	Russell
Eyrd	McCarran	Scruggam
Capper	McClellan	Smith
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	McNary	Vandenberg
George	Maybank	White
Gurney	Nye	
Hayden	O'Daniel	

NAYS—43

Alken	Hatch	Revercomb
Ball	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Kilgore	Taft
Brooks	La Follette	Truman
Butler	Langer	Tunnell
Chandler	Lucas	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Ferguson	Murray	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Green	Overton	
Gulley	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—22

Austin	Buck	Ellender
Bailey	Burton	Gillette
Barbour	Bushfield	Glass
Bone	Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.
Brewster	Connally	Moore

Pepper
Stewart
Thomas, Idaho

Thomas, Utah
Wiley
Tobey
Walsh

So the report was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments still in disagreement, request a further conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

Mr. PEPPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to state for the RECORD that when the vote was had a little while ago on agreeing to the conference report on House bill 2714, I was in consultation with certain governmental officials relative to some matters of importance pertaining to my State, and I was unable to be in the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted not to agree to the recommendation of the conferees relative to certain Federal employees, namely, Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett. I do not think the manner in which this question has been approached is a fair protection of the civil rights of these men, or wholesome legislation.

REPAIR OF DAMAGE CAUSED BY FLOODS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, we are all familiar with the devastation caused by the recent floods in the upper Mississippi, the Illinois, the Wabash, the Missouri, the Arkansas, and the White Rivers. It is necessary that the work of repairing the damage should be done at once.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have a little order in the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair asks the Senate to be in order. It is not in order.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the Chief of Engineers has testified that it is very necessary that the work of restoring the broken levees and of strengthening those which have been impaired be very promptly undertaken, and he has already made plans to carry that work into execution.

I desire, therefore, to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] dealing with that subject matter. When the bill is passed, which I think can be done, let me say, in a very few minutes—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I maintain the Senate is not in order. This is an important measure, and I desire to hear the discussion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is correct. The Senate has not been and is not in order. The Chair requests the Senate to be in order.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, it is necessary that the bill be passed, in order that there may be an appropriation made in the forthcoming deficiency appropriation bill. The authorization is for \$10,000,000 and unless the Senate

passes the bill the appropriation cannot be made.

The bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois was amended by the Committee on Commerce. There is only one controversial feature in reference to the amendment suggested by the Committee on Commerce, and that controversy has been amicably settled.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there is a rule of the Senate providing that Senators must occupy their seats or leave the Chamber. There is conversation going on so that I cannot understand what is happening.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair requests that Senators occupy their seats.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator—

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I want the order enforced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. OVERTON. May I now proceed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. The junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] offered an amendment, which is in section 2 of the bill, authorizing loans to be made by the R. F. C., with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission and under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers, to railroads whose tracks have been damaged or wiped out as a result of the recent floods.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

Mr. OVERTON. Will the Senator permit me to explain? It will take but a moment.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to know the number of the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Senate bill 1134.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it on the calendar?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1134) to amend section 5 of the Flood-Control Act, approved August 18, 1941.

Mr. OVERTON. The objection raised to the provision for loans to the railroads was that it was provided that the loans should be made without interest. The settlement of this controversial provision has been effected, I understand, with the Senator from Missouri, and an amendment will be offered which will provide that interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum shall be charged on such loans.

Mr. President, with this brief explanation, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Before consent is granted, if at all, I should like to make a very brief statement, which I feel morally bound to make.

I favored the bill, but on Friday, when the very able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] asked that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Military Establishment appropriation bill, I objected because the hearings had not been printed. At the same time I told the Senator that I should be willing to have that bill follow the bill which has just been recommitted to the conference.

I do not wish to consent to the consideration of the bill in which the Senator from Louisiana is interested, a legislative bill, when I promised that the Military Establishment appropriation bill might have the right of way. If the Senator from Oklahoma does not wish to exercise his right, I have no objection, but I am carrying out the promise I made and the understanding had on Friday and Saturday. If the Senator from Oklahoma desires the right of way to take up the Military Establishment appropriation bill, I shall object to the pending request. If the Senator is unconcerned about the matter I have fulfilled my duty.

Mr. OVERTON. The difference between the two bills is that there will be no trouble in disposing of the War Department appropriation bill, but in order to obtain an appropriation and proceed with this necessary work it is necessary to an authorization, and if an authorization is not now provided it will be too late.

Mr. McNARY. I understand the parliamentary situation, I know the necessity of having an authorization bill precede an appropriation bill, but that does not touch the moral aspects of the situation. I ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether he desires that the bill referred to by the Senator from Louisiana precede the bill he has in charge.

Mr. OVERTON. If I may make another observation before the Senator from Oklahoma proceeds, I think Senate bill 1134 can be disposed of in 5 minutes after the unanimous consent request is granted.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having in charge the War Department appropriation bill, I am ready to proceed with the consideration of the bill, but the bill sponsored by the Senator from Louisiana affects a flood-control area which embraces my State. So, personally, I am interested on behalf of my State, I may say for the benefit of the Senator from Oregon, and I should be very glad to have Senate bill 1134 acted on first.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McCARRAN. A point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I was engaged in a very inaudible conversation when this matter was presented. My point of order is that yesterday House bill 2935, an appropriation bill, was made the unfinished business for today. In that event it is the unfinished business, and should be proceeded with and disposed of before anything else is taken up. I make the point of order that House bill 2935 now has precedence on the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana asked for unanimous consent. Unanimous consent having been granted, the Senator from Louisiana has the right-of-way.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not understand unanimous consent to have been granted,

I certainly would not have consented to the request if I had known of it. I cannot consent to it now, if it is not too late. I was on the floor and on my feet attempting to get the attention of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that the Senator from Nevada should not be placed at a disadvantage because the Chair did not happen to be looking in his direction at the moment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think it will not take over 5 minutes to dispose of the all-important appropriation bill, which must go to conference and must be acted on before midnight. I have conferred with the Senator from Missouri, and the point he was about to raise I understand will not be raised, so that we can dispose of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. May I inquire of the able Senator to what bill he is referring?

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill we have been dealing with is House bill 2935, making appropriations for the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency. All that has to be done is to consider an amendment which will be offered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the passage of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would not like to be placed in the position of being too hasty in stating that unanimous consent had been obtained when the fact was that it was not obtained.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator from Nevada will yield, may I have his cooperation in having Senate bill 1134 passed, or acted upon by the Senate, by 3 o'clock this afternoon?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly, the Senator will have my cooperation in every way. I wish to say to the Senator that he has my cooperation, but I feel it is my responsibility to have House bill 2935 considered, so that it may go to the House and be enacted into law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection has been raised.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I modify my unanimous-consent request, and ask that immediately after the passage of the pending bill, and at not later than 3 o'clock this afternoon, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1134.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McNARY. I think we will be ready to take the bill up in 5 or 10 minutes, and I suggest that the Senator say "at or before 3 o'clock."

Mr. OVERTON. I said "at not later than 3 o'clock."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. In order to clarify the record and in order that the Chair may feel in no wise responsible, I wish to say that when the unanimous-consent proposal was made I was not attending to what was proceeding on the floor, I am very sorry to say, and the Chair was not to blame.

I now ask that the Senate resume the consideration of House bill 2935.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the able Senator from Nevada if he will not take a small item to conference which had to do with the first part of the bill when we were considering it. It is a small administrative item which affects the office of the Secretary of Labor. It amounts to \$34,000, and a very good case was made for it in the record of the committee. If agreed to the amendment would make the total appropriation for personal services in the District of Columbia \$366,000, instead of \$352,000. I ask the Senator from Nevada if he will not take it to conference for consideration.

Mr. McNARY. What is the figure the Senator wants increased?

Mr. TRUMAN. The appropriation now in the bill is \$352,000, and the increase asked is \$34,000, making the total appropriation \$386,000. It is a matter of administration in the District of Columbia, and if the increase is not granted, possibly the Department will be crippled in carrying out the mandates of the remainder of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Was the appropriation refused by the House committee?

Mr. TRUMAN. The figure in the bill, \$352,000, is the amount placed in it by the House committee.

Mr. McNARY. Was the Senator's proposal made to the Senate committee when it had the bill under study?

Mr. TRUMAN. No; it was not made to the full committee. The committee became involved in an argument, and the matter was overlooked. I am now asking the Senator from Nevada if he will take the amendment to conference for consideration there.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that this item is within the Budget estimate, but the House did not allow it, and the Senate committee did not allow it. At the same time there may be justification for it, and I announce that I am willing to take it to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 65 to strike out all of line 3 and down to and including line 19.

Mr. President, I will make a brief statement concerning the situation involved. Senators are probably familiar with the fact that the United States Employment Service was taken over by the Federal Government after we entered the war, or it may have been taken over

some time shortly prior to that. There has been a feeling or fear that because the Federal Government has taken this operating agency over for the duration of war, it might be a permanent move, and the House has been incorporating a prohibition against using any of the moneys to increase the salaries of any of the individuals in the United States Employment Service.

This organization, as Senators will realize, is the operating agency in dealing with the war manpower problem in the field. The result of this prohibition has been that although the employees in question are now in the Federal service, their salaries have still remained at the lower State level. The result is, for example, that if a stenographic examination is held in my State, and a number of persons pass it, they are immediately offered starting salaries in every other agency and branch of the Federal Government greatly in excess of the starting salary which can be paid in this particular agency, because in it the State salary level prevails.

Mr. President, I am satisfied there is no real issue in this item insofar as the question is concerned as to whether this agency is to be taken over permanently by the Federal Government. The only question is whether this very important arm of the War Manpower Commission shall be saved from the raiding of its personnel which has been going on by other Federal agencies. The turn-over in the various States of the Union varies, as I recall, anywhere from 25 to as high as 300 percent. It is obvious that this very important functioning agency of the War Manpower Commission should not be subjected to such crippling of its efficiency. Therefore, I trust that the Senator from Nevada will be willing to take this amendment to conference, and to give the matter serious consideration there.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this matter has been discussed by the Appropriations Committee for 2 and perhaps 3 years, and it has been turned down by the Appropriations Committee on each occasion. It was turned down again on the present occasion. In other words, the language placed in the bill by the House has been sustained by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and I cannot take the Senator's proposed amendment to conference.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say for the Record that at a time when we have a shortage of manpower and a manpower crisis in this country I think it is a tragic mistake to have the operating arm, the management arm, the functioning arm of the War Manpower Commission, in attempting to deal with this critical situation, partially paralyzed because of this restriction. If at the end of the war we want the United States Employment Service returned to its previous status it can be done by legislation, but in the meantime let us permit it to function efficiently, and not hamper it simply because there is opposition to permanent federalization of this service.

What harm can it do to permit these individuals to receive the same levels

of salaries paid in the other branches of the Federal Government? What harm can that do, so far as concerns the ultimate issue of deciding what disposition shall be made of the administrative agency in question? Congress will always have the power to legislate on that subject in the future. But now in the midst of this terrible war, when every Senator knows that manpower is one of our most serious problems, it is a great mistake to take this attitude simply because it has some indirect bearing on whether in the future this agency is to be at the Federal level or not. That is a question we can always determine.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say that I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin. I do not think the Senator's amendment involves a question as to whether when the war is over these employment services will go back to the States. Frankly, I feel they should go back to the States, and I think it is very likely that they will go back to the States. But I wish to say that I have the honor to be a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and that committee has held very extensive hearings on the question of manpower. When I say "extensive hearings," the fact is that we have been holding hearings on the subject of manpower from last October until 2 weeks ago. All through those hearings representatives of the War Manpower Commission, when asked why they did not do this or why they did not do that, spoke of how the work of the Manpower Commission is now crippled and impaired because of the enormous turn-over in the personnel of these offices. As the Senator from Wisconsin has said, these offices of the Employment Service constitute the machinery through which the Manpower Commission has to operate and does operate. This machinery is greatly crippled and impaired because it is not now possible to keep efficient persons in the service of the employment offices.

According to the testimony before the committee, the minute one of the offices employs a capable person, that person is given the opportunity to obtain a job in some Federal agency at a higher rate of pay for doing the same kind of work, and, of course, he does what we would do, or what anyone else would do, and naturally takes the job which provides the higher pay. One of the most serious problems now confronting the War Manpower Commission as testified by Governor McNutt, and attested by practically every other representative of the Manpower Commission who has appeared before the Military Affairs Committee, is the problem of not being able to retain capable and efficient personnel in these offices, with the constant and enormous turn-over in their personnel because of the relatively very low pay now allowed for their employees.

Mr. President, I was very hopeful that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee would at least take the proposed amendment to conference, but

since he does not agree to do so I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment. That will place the whole matter in conference, and there the conferees may go into the matter further, and obtain a better picture than perhaps they have been able to obtain of the situation with reference to the operation of the War Manpower Commission and how the Commission is now crippled and its work impaired because of the relatively very low salaries which are allowed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say a further word in conclusion. I realize that probably to some extent the Federal Security Administrator has brought this on his own head, because I think in all sincerity and conviction he has announced that he is in favor of taking over the unemployment compensation service and federalizing it. I think the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] contains a provision for that to be done.

But Mr. President, that is not the issue, as I see it. What harm can it do, so far as that issue is concerned, to raise these salaries to a level comparable to those paid by the Federal Government? We can determine, and can fight out here when the time comes, what shall be done with the service. So far as I am concerned, I am convinced that, wherever possible, we should maintain the Federal-State relationship. I think it is a mistake to go in the other direction; but for purposes of war it was considered necessary to take the service over, and it has been taken over.

Now why cannot we, for the duration of the war, at least, provide it with a sufficient salary scale so that it can retain its employees and do a creditable job in a very important situation?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think it should be emphasized, too, that the Federal Government in taking over the offices did so with the voluntary cooperation of the States. The States themselves recognized that in this time of war, in this time of great emergency, the offices had to be turned over to the Federal Government; and they were voluntarily turned over by the States, for the war period, and in full agreement, so to speak, and cooperation between the Federal Government and the States.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have submitted the amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will prevail, as I think it is well worth while.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield the floor.

Mr. MEAD. I merely desire to say that the disparity between the wage rates for the Federal service and for the State service is more widespread now, as the result of the passage of the \$300 bonus bill for Federal employees. I am in thorough accord with the Senator

from Wisconsin on his amendment, and I trust it will prevail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPAIR OF DAMAGE CAUSED BY FLOODS

Under the order previously entered, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 1134) to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 13, 1941, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the sum of \$10,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods: *Provided*, That pending appropriation of said sum Secretary of War may allot from existing flood-control appropriations such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from the unobligated funds from the appropriation "Flood control, general," made available in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, for specific purposes therein enumerated.

SEC. 2. In order to aid in the rehabilitation, including necessary relocation, protection, and elevation above flood plane, of railroads engaged in interstate commerce whose properties have been destroyed or damaged in whole or in part by flood in 1943, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, is authorized to make rehabilitation loan or loans to any such railroad or to the receivers or trustees thereof in such manner upon such terms and conditions and with such security as the corporation may prescribe; except that each such loan shall bear no interest and shall contain provisions for the amortization thereof over a period of not to exceed 40 years. The total amount of loans

and commitments to railroads, receivers, and trustees under this section shall not exceed at any one time \$25,000,000. The amount of note, bond, debenture, and other such obligation which the corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provision of this section. The proceeds of any loan made pursuant to this section shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

Sec. 3. The provisions of this act shall be deemed to be additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of, existing general legislation authorizing allocation of flood-control funds for restoration of flood-control works threatened or destroyed by flood.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in making the initial request, I explained the purpose and object of the bill. I simply desire to add to the observations I have already made the statement that the record shows that the area inundated during recent floods along the streams I have mentioned comprises a little more than 9,000,000 acres, the damage is estimated at \$96,000,000, and there were reported the deaths of 62 persons.

With that explanation, I submit the bill.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has an amendment to offer, and I shall be glad to yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 9, it is proposed to strike out the words "shall bear no interest" and insert "shall bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, has the clerk just read the amendment offered yesterday by the able junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has just been offered.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of what the Senator from North Dakota seeks to achieve by the amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. If the inquiry is addressed to me, and if I have the floor, I shall be very glad to answer.

Section 1 of the bill undertakes to take care of the damages suffered by railroads by an act of God, in the case of the tremendous floods which caused the sweeping away of trackage and other damage to railroads, especially where they crossed the rivers. I think the evidence shows that in one case the waters impounded in a dam were inadvertently released, and, as a result, one or two of the railroads suffered very great damage.

Section 2 provides that in order to aid in the rehabilitation, including necessary relocation, protection, and elevation above flood plane, of the railroads which were so damaged, loans may be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation,

with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and they shall be amortized over a period not to exceed 40 years. The committee amendment, as reported, provided that the loans should bear no interest. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota provides that they shall bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], who was the author of the railroad amendment, is agreeable to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota. As the Senator who handled the bill, I am raising no objection to it.

I desire to say it is very necessary that the bill be passed, and I desire to have it passed without any controversial item in it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say that whoever was the author of the bill certainly had in mind that the railroads might need some assistance.

Mr. OVERTON. No doubt.

Mr. DANAHER. And it was deemed to be in the public interest that there be a source to which the railroads could apply for funds; is not that so?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. It is also to be presumed that if the author of the bill thought it would be in the public interest that a loan period of 40 years be provided, it would be advantageous to the public to have the loans made without interest; is it not?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. At that point someone has decided that, even if the railroads need loans, and even if it be in the public interest to have the railroads receive them, it must be in the public interest to have the railroads pay 3 percent interest per annum. I do not know whether the railroads can, in the event of need, finance such loans at the rate of 3 percent. I do not know whether such a provision is fair. Has the committee had any information as to whether 3 percent is the proper rate?

Mr. OVERTON. The information which the Commerce Committee had on that question was, first, as to the damage which had been caused; second, that some of the railroads were in bankruptcy or receivership; and that in respect to all the railroads, they were acting under an advice amounting practically to an admonition from the Interstate Commerce Commission to retire as rapidly as possible their interest-bearing indebtedness, in order to avoid the payment of interest thereon and in order to have a reserve capital with which to meet the impact of the post-war period. Therefore the suggestion was made that the loans be granted to the railroads without any interest, upon the further argument that the railroads are doing a great public service; that commerce on the railroads was interrupted by the floods, and is continuing to be interrupted, at a time when, in the prosecution

tion of the war, it is very necessary to transport as rapidly as possible troops, munitions, and matériel of war. In order that the work of rehabilitating the railroads may proceed promptly, the Federal Government should offer the inducement of letting them have the money on collateral security without interest. That is the argument.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. In view of the fact that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is to be permitted to make these rehabilitation loans only with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I take it it is to be presumed that the Interstate Commerce Commission may deny permission to any railroad to borrow.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. In order that the public interest may properly be served, and in order that the desire of the Senator from North Dakota and those who share his views may be executed, at least in part, I offer, as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, language which will read:

Shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 3 percent per annum.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from South Dakota conferred with me regarding this bill, which provides for loans without interest. I suggested 3 percent, because the Disaster Loan Corporation, an agency of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, charges cities, townships, counties, and other political subdivisions which have suffered similar losses 3 percent. I thought probably it was an equitable adjustment of the interest rate. However, if money can be obtained at a lower rate, that is all right. I say that in all fairness to the Senator, because I made the suggestion based wholly on the practice established by the Disaster Loan Corporation in charging 3 percent to private or public corporations and institutions which meet with situations similar to the one described by the able Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, this was my amendment. It has been my privilege to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee with the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and to have made a complete and thorough investigation of the financial set-up of the railroads.

Nearly all the southwestern railroads are located in the particular flood area to which the bill of the Senator from Louisiana relates. Ninety percent of them are in receivership. At least one has been almost completely washed away. It is absolutely essential in this wartime traffic. It cannot be replaced unless the Government takes it over and replaces it.

I had thought that the widening of the openings on a great many of the southwestern streams, the changing of the railroad alignment along the Illinois

River and the Wabash River, and the opening of the bridgehead at Fort Smith, Ark., would have a very great effect on the farm lands which have been inundated by the recent floods. We have never had an over-all flood-control picture for the whole Mississippi Valley. Flood-control work has been done on a piecemeal basis. Back in 1935 a program was outlined by the National Resources Planning Board which called for an over-all flood-control program taking into consideration the small rivers. It is the small rivers which cause flood disasters. The Arkansas River, the White River, the St. Francis River, the Illinois River, the Sangamon River, the Wabash River, the Grand River in Missouri, the Osage River in Missouri, and half a dozen others were the cause of the disastrous floods which washed out farm crops.

I do not want the railroads to have any special privileges over the farmers or anyone else; and when the Senator from North Dakota suggested an interest rate, I suggested to him that it be made not greater than 3 percent, because money can be borrowed on short-term paper for as little as one-half of 1 percent. The same argument was made to me as was made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, that the Disaster Loan Corporation charges 3 percent for rehabilitation loans in the Ohio River Valley. I do not think the railroads ought to have any special privileges, but this is a movement in the public interest, and unless some of the railroads are relocated, unless bridges are raised, and new bridges built in many places, there will be an additional flood menace every time a heavy rainfall occurs in the Mississippi Basin.

I am perfectly willing to accept any amendment which is reasonable, just, and fair so far as the farmers and the railroads are concerned. I have no objection to an interest rate being charged. My idea in offering the amendment in the form in which it was offered was based upon the fact that the railroads affected are nearly all in receivership, and those which are not in receivership are skating so close to the edge that if it had not been for the war effort some of them would now be in receivership.

With that explanation, I am perfectly willing to accept any amendment on the interest question which is fair to all concerned.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the recent floods caused thousands of farmers to lose all they had. They are broke. They are putting in late crops. They are doing just as much for the public interest as are the railroads. I understand that they are obliged to pay 3-percent interest. If the Disaster Loan Corporation charges farmers 3 percent I think the railroads should pay the same rate. That is the purpose of my amendment. If it charges less, there is no objection to the railroads paying less, provided the farmers also pay less.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show, because I am a member of the Commerce Committee, that at the committee meet-

ing yesterday I offered an amendment which would strike out that part of the bill providing that money may be loaned to the railroads without interest. The amendment was defeated in the committee. I then explained to the able chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. OVERTON] that I would offer an amendment to the bill on the floor. Thereafter I discussed the matter with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and told him that I had planned to offer an amendment. I do not do so because of the amendment which is now before the Senate.

I wish the RECORD to show clearly that I feel that this would be a most dangerous precedent. I think that the argument, sincerely made, that the railroads serve the public welfare, certainly applies in equal measure to the farmer, and to almost everyone else. I am very hopeful that this amendment will prevail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY] to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] as amended to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment, as amended, to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, is the committee amendment pending? I have a separate amendment to offer.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, what action has the Senate taken?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY] to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was agreed to, and then the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, was also agreed to. That means, in effect, that the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to suspend all quota provisions and other limitations with respect to the production of agricultural commodities in any area affected by floods in 1943 whenever he finds that crops have been destroyed or plantings interfered with or washed out in such area by reason of such floods, and he is further authorized to permit the maximum planting in such area of any crops which are essential to the war effort.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I did not catch the full import of the first part

of the amendment. However, as to the latter part—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I will yield out of mere courtesy to the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I did not wish to take the Senator off his feet, but the amendment itself seems to me to be self-explanatory. It simply provides that as to land which has been flooded, and on which replanting is necessary, the quotas and allotments shall be suspended for this year. In other words, a great deal of that land is the best corn land in the world. Crops which were planted there were washed out, and it will be necessary to replant them. It is still possible to grow a corn crop, but it is not possible to grow flax and some other crops which had been planted.

Mr. McNARY. I do not believe that any quotas on the plantation of corn have been worked out as being applicable for this year. As I recall, last year the only quotas were on wheat. Those quotas have been removed for this year. I do not think there are quotas on any crops for this year. However, in any event, whether I am misinformed or not, I have no objection to the amendment because farmers should be permitted the greatest freedom in the planting of whatever crop is most suitable for the soil and for the market.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, when the agricultural appropriation bill was pending an amendment was offered and accepted which provided that all restrictions on the planting of cotton should be removed in the green-bug infested areas and in the flood-devastated areas throughout the country. That amendment was agreed to by the Senate and it has since been agreed to in conference. There is only one crop over which control is being exercised, and that is cotton. There are no allocations for wheat, flax, rye, or anything except cotton. As I understand, the amendment has already been agreed to by the conference committee and has been approved by both Houses of Congress. While I am in favor of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri, I think it comes too late as the whole matter has been already effectively covered.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, while I cannot speak for the Commerce Committee because the amendment was not before that committee, personally I have no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I send forward another amendment which I ask to have read.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell me where in the bill there is a provision for the rebuilding of bridges which have been washed out? When the bill was

introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] he spoke of the destruction of bridges. In my State many bridges have been washed out. Where is their repair provided for in the bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as I know, the question of local bridges is not provided for in the bill. In my State we are having the second flood of this year. Each of them has been as serious as any flood on the Missouri River since 1903. There is not a passable bridge across the Missouri River from St. Louis to Kansas City at the present time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as I recall, a few days ago the Senate passed a bill which took care of the problem of the repair and the construction of roads and bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by the floods. An amendment was attached to a bill which came over from the House, as it may be recalled, by which we undertook to provide for the repairs and replacement of bridges and roads which were destroyed by floods, and set up a \$20,000,000 emergency fund for that purpose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. The War Production Board, and every other governmental agency which has jurisdiction over allocations and priorities relating to farm machinery and equipment, are authorized and directed immediately to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for the necessary allocations and priorities to enable farmers in the areas affected by floods in 1943 to replace and repair their farm machinery and equipment which was destroyed or damaged by such floods, and to continue farming operations.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the amendment simply provides, so far as possible, a directive to the War Production Board, or other governmental agencies of adequate jurisdiction, to assist and aid farmers who, in many cases, lost their farm implements and necessary fencing, by granting to them priorities so far as possible in order that they may continue their farming operations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. However, in order that we may keep the record straight, I should like to make an observation having reference to the War Production Board.

At this moment the War Production Board will grant priorities to anyone who needs fencing, farm machinery, or any other implements which have been destroyed by floods. So far no one has filed any complaints through my office because of inability to obtain priorities from the War Production Board. As I have said, I have no objection to the amendment, but I think great credit is due the War Production Board for its recognition of the emergency in my section of the country as well as in sections of the Southwest and the granting of priorities immediately and with expedition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I send forward another amendment which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment it is proposed to add the following:

SEC. 6. That in order to aid in the rehabilitation of farmers whose buildings, crops, livestock, machinery, and equipment were destroyed or damaged, in whole or in part, by floods in 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide relief to any such farmer, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, for the purpose of aiding such farmer to replace or repair any property so destroyed or damaged, and to obtain the necessary seed, livestock, and equipment to enable him to continue farming operations.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$15,000,000 for carrying out the provisions of this act.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have followed very carefully our ventures in the field of relief. I recall that a good many years ago Congress relieved the farmers of North Dakota by buying feed and it also went into the question of fertilizer and food.

Then we loaned money on easy terms for machinery. We thought we had about reached the limit of what the Federal Government should do for the farmers. Evidently it is now proposed to go very much further than we have gone heretofore. As I understand, a previous amendment provided for priorities, and I have no objection to that. The pending amendment mentions seed, livestock, and equipment. Then there is an authorization for a large sum of money. Does that mean that each one of these farmers may acquire a cow, if necessary, or hogs, and seed and all that sort of thing, to reequip his farm on a loan basis? If so, what is the standard? I want to be charitable, but I also want to be careful. I have seen this program grow and grow and grow and I do not want it to be placed on an emotional basis or to be considered a mere reaction to sentiment. Let us always be sensible.

I am rather sorry that the able Senator has offered the amendment. It touches me to object to a proposition of this kind, but I thought, with the relief granted by the bill as originally proposed, plus the charge of an interest rate which was fair to the railroads, and the amendment heretofore adopted the bill would be sufficient, but now we are getting into an entirely new field.

We have other agencies which can do this job without additional legislation. I rather think the Senator is running a chance of losing his entire bill and exhausting sympathy by trying to do something that is not practicable. I do not know who offered the amendment, but, whoever offered it, it seems to me not to be advisable.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I offered it.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. Then, I suggest to my great friend from Mis-

souri, who generally exercises rare judgment—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. That he is about to submarine his own effort. I am through.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I say very frankly that the amendment which I have proposed goes considerably further than the original scope of the bill. The original scope of the bill is limited in respect to the restoration of public works in the nature of dikes and things of that sort. But I say that in this emergency, in view of the serious food shortage which now confronts the people of the United States, it is necessary to go further, not as a means of extending charity to the farmers, not as a means of extending charity to anybody, but as a method of stepping up, so far as possible, food production in the United States, which by the ruinous floods which have taken place has been set back to an almost unprecedented degree in this year when it is worse needed than ever before. As I said a moment ago, in the Missouri Valley we are experiencing our second flood of the year, each one of which has been greater than any flood the Missouri Valley has suffered since 1903.

The Senator from Oregon very properly says that this is somewhat of a departure, but we have had many departures in the last few years. We are spending Government money all over the world without any hope of ever getting it back, under the lease-lend policy; and to say that we are justified in financing production of food to be given to Russia or to England or to north Africa or to any place else, and that we are not justified in protecting ourselves so far as possible by restoring to production this year in a great emergency thousands upon thousands of acres of the most fertile land on the habitable globe, seems to me to be preposterous on its face.

I am not in favor of charity; but this is an emergency; this is the time when we need food more than we have ever needed it in any year in the whole history of the United States; we have assumed obligations practically to feed the world, and to suggest that, by reason of some technicality, we have to sit by with our hands folded and allow this enormous acreage of very valuable alluvial land to go out of cultivation, in this great national disaster, simply does not make sense to me. Therefore, I propose this amendment. It is very frankly for direct relief rather than what is contained in the original bill, which was simply for restoration of public works, which, of itself, is a very meritorious object, and with which I thoroughly agree, but it seems to me that such an emergency now confronts us that direct action is necessary.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not want to be accused of being technical. That is a charge which may be brought against a lawyer; I am an orchard man.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly did not intend to make any charge against the distinguished Senator from Oregon for whom, as he knows, I have the very highest respect.

Mr. McNARY. The great legal mind of the able Senator from Missouri might look at the technical side; I am not thinking of that side; but I am trying really to do the Senator a kindness which he does not understand or appreciate. He will probably get into such a situation that he will lose his bill; but I shall not dwell on that.

In the greatest seriousness, Mr. President, let me say emergencies are always occurring. This is not the first emergency. I remember when Mr. Hoover was Secretary of Commerce, after I came to the Senate, nearly a quarter of a century ago, I went with him and others down the Mississippi River and saw the devastating flood then raging—the greatest ever in the history of that grand old river. That was an emergency. We did not buy farmers cows and spans of mules and harness and oats and barley and alfalfa hay and what not. The farmers who were affected worked out their own destiny. We did, however, appropriate money and extended to them the hope that such a disaster would not occur in the future. I supported legislation along that line to the extent of many millions of dollars, and I am now happy that I did so. That is what we did to insure them against future devastation.

I am willing to go further than this bill, but the Senator need not talk to me about emergencies. As I have said, we always have emergencies; we have had them everywhere all the time. It is just as sorrowful for a farmer to lose a cow 1 year as it is another. The whole thing is the loss of the cow. It is useless to appeal to me on the ground of patriotism and on the statement that this is an unusual situation. That is all folded. A cow is a cow "for a' that."

I may not be technical, but I cannot think loosely on these questions.

Mr. President, there is no standard provided governing what the Secretary of Agriculture may do to help these farmers. Is he to buy these things and furnish them gratuitously to the farmers, or is he to loan the money? If so, at what rate? This is the only bill I recall where we have not, by some means or method, worked out a formula whereby the farmer could obtain relief while he paid to the Government a part of the money.

I am appealing to the very able Senator, my very dear friend from Missouri. Does he contemplate that the \$15,000,000 proposed to be appropriated shall be used to restock these farms without any return of principal to the Government or any penalty in the form of interest? What is his plan?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The amendment provides for direct relief; there can be no question about that.

Mr. McNARY. So we are giving \$15,000,000 to the group of farmers who have suffered this loss without any obligation whatsoever on their part to repay it or return it to the Government?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We have given about \$15,000,000,000 to various other peoples in the world.

Mr. McNARY. I understand that; I voted for those appropriations; but that

is the history, and I never found any reason to justify a bill by going back to a study of immediate history. I let the historian of the future write history. That is based on experience and on common sense.

Mr. President, I have given my views. I doubt very much the wisdom at this time of starting on a new process, a new formula for relief which has never been justified by experience and which has not had the sanction of legislative action. But if the Senate wants to do so, I do not want to hold up the bill. I realize we must pass the appropriation bills, and dispose of the conference report, because tomorrow will be the last day of the fiscal year. I subside by saying I think that the pending proposal is hasty, unfortunate, and untimely.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in reference to the pending amendment offered by the able Senator from Missouri, I wish to say that it was not referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce. Therefore, when we considered the bill we did not consider the amendment. As a printed reproduction of it shows, it was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In the form in which I offered the amendment, it was changed to an authorization. Of course, the printed bill which I introduced as a separate measure contained provision for a direct appropriation, and therefore was properly referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I have now changed it, and in the form in which I offer it as an authorization it is proper to refer it to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. OVERTON. It has not yet been so referred.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No, but I am offering it as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand. I wish to make the statement that the Senate Committee on Commerce, in considering Senate bill 1134, the pending bill, did not consider this amendment, because it had not been referred to the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me, the Senator will recall that I gave notice in the committee of my intention to offer it as an amendment to this bill.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct, and I was about to make that observation. During the hearing the Senator from Missouri stated that he proposed to offer not only this amendment, but the other two amendments which have been adopted, when the bill came up for consideration. He said he was going to offer the amendments on the floor of the Senate.

Personally I have no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri, but I cannot accept it as representing the Senate Commerce Committee. As to whether or not it is such an amendment as should receive committee consideration before being acted upon by the Senate is a matter which addresses itself to the sound judgment of the Sen-

ate. It is of course a very important amendment, authorizing an appropriation larger than that authorized by the bill itself. The bill authorizes an appropriation of \$10,000,000, while the amendment authorizes an appropriation of \$15,000,000.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I can well understand the motives which prompt the Senator from Missouri in offering the amendment. I can also understand the observation made by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I wonder if the proposed work could not be done by the Farm Security Administration. As I recall, several years ago there were some disastrous floods in Alabama, and the Farm Security Administration moved in and gave us relief very much in line with the relief suggested by the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. I wonder what the Senator would think about putting this work under the Farm Security Administration, because in that agency the machinery and the procedure are available which the Senator from Oregon has suggested are lacking.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should have no objection to that, but it was originally my idea that the matter should be handled by the Disaster Loan Corporation. I consulted with various agencies of Government, which all recognize the very desperate necessity for immediate action in the way of direct relief if crops in the widespread area affected are to be saved, but the best advice I could get, after consulting with everyone I could think of consulting, was that it was probably better to put the matter under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. It did not seem to fit into the particular niche of any governmental agency, except the general authority of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator confer with the head of the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was in touch with him; I did not personally confer with him.

Mr. HILL. I have in mind what the Farm Security Administration did in somewhat similar circumstances in the State of Alabama several years ago, in conditions growing out of floods, and knowing they have an organization set-up and prescribed for such work.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It does not make the slightest difference to me what agency handles the matter. What I am interested in is in getting relief for the flood sufferers, and more particularly in attempting to save the crops in that extremely important agricultural area this year.

Mr. HILL. It was the observation of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, together with my own observation of what the Farm Security Administration had done in Alabama, which prompted me to express the thought that perhaps if the Senator placed the administration of the activity in the hands of the Farm

Security Administration it would meet the questions raised by the Senator from Oregon. There we have a going agency whose business it is to rehabilitate farmers and to do the very work proposed by the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should be perfectly willing to accept any modification, so long as the work was done. The only thing with which I am concerned is having the situation relieved, and having it done in time for the distressed farmers to make a crop this year.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEPPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. OVERTON. I shall yield the floor in a moment.

As the Senator from Missouri knows, I am very much in sympathy not only with the amendments he offered and which have already been agreed to, but I am in sympathy with the amendment he has just offered. It is an amendment of much greater magnitude than the other amendments, carrying authorization for an appropriation of \$15,000,000, and I was thinking it might be best that the amendment be offered as a separate bill, and receive committee consideration and have hearings, for no committee consideration has been given to it, as the Senator knows.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. I think it can be done very expeditiously, and I think it should be done at once, because I see very readily what the Senator has in mind.

If it were done when 'tis done, then 't were well it were done quickly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If it is to be done, it must be done right away, or it will not be effective.

Mr. OVERTON. I certainly shall co-operate with the Senator from Missouri to obtain speedy committee action, if it shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce, and is to be regarded as a flood-control measure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think there is not any question that, as I have offered the measure, as an amendment to the pending bill, it is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce. It was properly referred to the Committee on Appropriations as I originally introduced it, because it carried a direct appropriation.

Mr. OVERTON. If it shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce, as chairman of the subcommittee having jurisdiction of such matters, I shall undertake immediately to conduct a hearing and report the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not willing to jeopardize the bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois, and, with the understanding suggested by the Senator from Louisiana, I withdraw the amendment, and intend to offer it as a separate bill, and have it referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to the senior Senator from Missouri for withdrawing the amendment to the pending bill, because

I should have some fear of the bill receiving immediate attention, if the Senator's amendment had become part of the measure, and also desire to commend the chairman and subcommittee of the Commerce Committee upon the efficient and speedy manner in which they have considered this legislation.

Some time ago I was called to my home in Illinois. At that time the floods in the Illinois valley were at the very highest peak, and upon my return, after viewing the devastation caused by the floods, I set about to contact the various agencies of government which could afford any relief whatsoever in the various sections of this country and the many people affected thereby.

I first called the Farm Credit Administration and found, through Dr. Warburton, who is deputy governor of that organization, that action to provide immediate aid in the form of loans to farmers for replanting crops destroyed by flood was being carried on at that time. He said that all the money necessary to make the loans needed in connection with the crops which had been destroyed was available.

I conferred with the Red Cross at the time in order to ascertain what they were doing, and learned that they were also on the job in my section of the State, as well as in the other flooded areas.

The Disaster Loan Corporation was standing by, for instance, ready to give aid and comfort to the sufferers of the flood the moment the flood began to recede, by making disaster loans primarily to home owners in the flooded districts, whose homes had been destroyed. The Federal Works Agency was attempting to do something in the way of repairing and reconstructing the facilities of the different localities, which had been destroyed, such as the sewer systems, water works, and other utilities which had gone under as the result of the high water.

The only thing affected by the flood which was not covered directly by an agency was roads and highways. That has been taken care of by an amendment proposed by the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. The sewer systems and other facilities and utilities of certain municipalities along the affected area will also require some relief. It is my understanding that by the Lanham bill, which was passed by the House, several million dollars is appropriated for this particular purpose. That bill is now pending before the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, as I recall.

Mr. President, my bill is an emergency measure. That is why I was happy that the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] withdrew his amendment. The other amendments he offered, of course, will make little or no difference.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The distinguished Senator from Illinois has just stated that the measure is an emergency one. I

wanted to inquire with respect to the provisions on page 2, lines 9 to 11, inclusive, under which \$10,000,000 is authorized—

For the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who introduced the bill, if that language will prevent the Army engineers from doing more than merely rebuilding the levees or existing flood-control works which were destroyed? In other words, would the language be sufficient to authorize and permit the strengthening of the levees by increasing both the grade and section, or would it limit their reconstruction or repair simply to replacing them in substantially the same condition as they existed prior to the flood and destruction?

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say in reply to the able Senator from Arkansas that when I returned from Illinois I also discussed with the War Department the question of the rebuilding and the rehabilitating of these levees which had been destroyed by the flood, and learned from the War Department that under section 5 of the Flood Control Act the War Department was limited to the spending of \$1,000,000 per annum for purposes of rebuilding and repairing levees and other flood projects. There remained in the fund an unobligated balance at that time of approximately \$30,000,000. I was informed that when a flood destroys a levee the Department, under the present law, is unable to rebuild that levee to a greater height than its present height, or to widen the base to a greater width than its present width. Further, the present law would keep the War Department from undertaking to repair or rebuild something which had been destroyed by the flood, though considered to be an immediate emergency, if it were, let us say, 300 yards away from the flood project. Those are basic factors in section 5 of the Flood Control Act.

I immediately conferred with the War Department with the view toward eliminating all those restrictions. My bill in the first instance provided that the Department could spend any portion of the unobligated balance, that it could widen the base of the levee and build it to any height the engineers thought necessary in view of the recent experience, and also any emergency caused by the excessive high water could be given attention.

The Department contends that the language as rewritten, covers all the points which I raised in my original conversation with them, and which is included in the language of the original bill I introduced. The word "strengthen" in the amendment is broad enough to extend the base and increase the height. They did not like the word "emergency" in the original bill. They thought that such a word might be used in a broad sense that would go too far, so it was stricken; however, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, that the bill provides all the necessary power to do what the Senator has inquired about in his direct

inquiry to me. Had the War Department representatives not given me such an interpretation, I would have insisted upon the original language. The amended bill is the same that is now being used, as I understand, by the flood-control committee of the House of Representatives, which has reported out a bill similar to mine. So the House and the Senate committees, and the War Department are satisfied that the language in question will be all that is necessary to provide the relief we need.

One of the primary reasons—in fact, the major reason—I introduced this proposed legislation to existing law was the fact that in my home city of Havana, Ill., we saw the water rise to the highest point it has risen in all of the town's history. In 1844 occurred the previous highest flood in that valley, and so far as records show the flood this year rose 3 feet higher than it was in 1844. Consequently the water went over the top of practically every levee along the river. The seawall at Beardstown, a city of some nine or ten thousand population below Havana some 30 miles, held the water with sacks of sand piled some 3 feet on top of the levee. Great credit is due not only to the civilian population of that community for working day and night to save the city but to the soldiers, who rendered a tremendous amount of useful and hard work in connection with keeping the water from flooding the city and causing much damage. This is only one example of many, which show the necessity for immediate legislation.

Mr. President, my bill will give the Department an opportunity immediately to start planning and making specifications for the rebuilding of the levees to a greater height, for widening their base, and in some places setting back levees where bottlenecks exist with respect to holding back the flow of the water. At certain spots along the Illinois River and other rivers there are narrow stretches from bank to bank. The water cannot flow through fast enough.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to thank the Senator from Illinois for his statement. The only thing I was really concerned about was the language to which I referred. I wondered whether it would permit the Army engineers really to do what has been found necessary to be done in view of recent experience. The recent floods have shown that it is necessary to set the levees back. I wondered whether in undertaking to repair and restore the levees the engineers could increase the section and grade and strength of the levee in an effort to prevent a disaster such as we have lately experienced. It occurred to me that merely replacing the levees and the flood control works, restoring them, in other words, to their previous condition, would ultimately possibly prove to be a waste of money.

In my State in the sections which have suffered in the recent floods the people are greatly concerned with respect to this matter. They are hoping that when

the work is done under any emergency legislation Congress may enact, or whenever the Army engineers set about to repair the damage, they will take into account the height of the flood, and in making expenditures and in doing this work try to build the levees sufficiently strong, and make such provision with respect to setting them back and establishing flood control protection as to be equal to the exigencies of another emergency and disaster such as has lately been experienced.

I thank the Senator, and I desire to commend him for the bill. It is very timely legislation. It is greatly needed, and I hope the day will soon come when we shall have what the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] referred to earlier in the discussion on the measure, namely, a broad, all-inclusive flood-control and water-development program for the streams of the Nation, not only for my State, but for the whole Nation. Looking to the post-war era, I think that such a program offers one of the greatest opportunities for employment and rehabilitation the Nation can enter upon, because in a period of years it will be one which will be justified and self-sustaining and self-supporting.

I thank the Senator, and I commend him for the legislation he is sponsoring.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator is very kind in his remarks. He is obviously correct, in his conclusion with respect to the lands of this Nation, subject to overflow.

Let me say to the Senator that the pending bill is only a drop in the bucket so far as the real control of floods is concerned. The \$10,000,000 provided for in the pending bill, as I have previously stated, is strictly an emergency appropriation. However, until the bill becomes law the Army engineers cannot make a single move in the direction of the rebuilding of the levees, unless they want to build them to the same height at which they stood in the valleys last year.

Consequently, as soon as the bill becomes law the Army engineers will be able to lay down their plans and blue prints and specifications with respect to what should be done along every river in the sections which have suffered the tremendous amount of damage from the floods.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In connection with what the able Senator has just stated, Mr. President, I say to him that, as I understand his bill, once the bill is enacted, under its provisions the Army engineers will not have to await the appropriation, following the bill. The bill provides that they may immediately begin the work by the use of existing appropriations. Is not that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. I think one of the reasons we want to have the bill passed today is to have the \$10,000,000 included in the deficiency appropriation bill which now is pending before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That would make it certain.

Mr. LUCAS. I think I am correct in that statement.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I certainly hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. LUCAS. One further observation, Mr. President, and then I shall conclude. As I said a moment ago, the \$10,000,000 is only the beginning. It is strictly for an emergency, and, as the testimony shows, is about all the engineers can spend in an efficient and economical way before a long-range, well-defined program can be submitted. But the record should show now—and I know this will be done—that an over-all survey will be made of every flooded area throughout the United States, with the view to attempting once and for all to harness the waters which come down in the spring-time or in the fall as a result of the heavy rains at those times. We have done, as the Senator from Missouri, I think it was, stated, a piecemeal job upon the flood-control projects throughout the country. It will cost no little sum of money to do the proper job. But if the plan is laid in a way which will take care of the future insofar as concerns the elimination of the damages which frequently occur, the result will be that money will be saved over a long period of time. Each and every year, as a result of the floods, Congress appropriates millions upon millions of dollars—and rightfully so—to this or that agency for relief for the losses sustained. Vision and safety compel me to say that such money should be expended for a great program of flood relief for the whole Nation.

Such a plan is one matter to which the Committee on Post-War Planning, of which the able Senator from Georgia is chairman, certainly should give a tremendous amount of consideration in connection with the problem of unemployment following the war.

I desire to take this opportunity to commend the Army engineers for what they are doing at the present time. Many a hole or a gap in the levees through which the water has rushed is now being repaired. The Army engineers have been able to find a sufficient amount of money in the War Department to enable them to start the work. The sooner they can plug the holes and let the drainage commissioners or the individual land owners have an opportunity to get their pumps in working order, so that they can pump the water from the drainage districts, the sooner will come the time when the farmers, even in those flooded spots, perhaps, will have an opportunity to plant corn and grow a crop, providing the weatherman is with us this fall.

Mr. President, I have said all I intend to say on the bill. I think there is no objection to it on the part of the able majority and minority leaders in the Senate. It is a meritorious measure. It is vital, and should be passed without any delay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1134) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and other purposes."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1026) to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities of the War Department or of the Army.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 832) relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 332) to revise the Alaska game law.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GIFFORD, and Mr. CRAWFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 82. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 85. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2618. An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2828. An act to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 2943. An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government;

H. R. 2988. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other pur-

poses," approved December 26, 1941, as amended; and

H. R. 3020. An act to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 217. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect;

S. 650. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932;

H. R. 332. An act to revise the Alaska game law;

H. R. 1648. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2397. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2513. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 82. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 85. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2618. An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2828. An act to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 2988. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2943. An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 3020. An act to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2996, the War Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, as I stated earlier in the day, on last Saturday I requested that the bill go over until Monday, in order that the hearings might be printed and in order that Senators might have an opportunity to study the various provisions of the bill. The Senator from Oklahoma responded to my request magnificently and generously, and I join him in seeking to have the bill made the unfinished business. I am anxious to dispose of it. It is necessary to dispose of it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, today is the 29th of June. Tomorrow will be the last day of this fiscal year. The bill carries some amendments which may not be agreed to in conference, and it may not be finally acted upon prior to the end of this fiscal year. In order that the bill may carry a section which will make it retroactive to July 1, and take care of the time intervening between July 1 and the date of its final approval, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk. It is the same provision which such bills ordinarily carry to provide for the time intervening between the beginning of the new fiscal year and the date when the bill is finally approved.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not interested in amendments at this time. They are not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon object to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. I do not. I should like to have the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma acted upon. I join the Senator in the desire that it may now be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the committee amendments have heretofore been agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Chandler	Hawkes
Andrews	Chavez	Hayden
Ball	Clark, Mo.	Hill
Bankhead	Danaher	Holman
Barkley	Davis	Johnson, Colo.
Bilbo	Downey	Kilgore
Bone	Eastland	La Follette
Bridges	Ferguson	Langer
Brooks	George	Lodge
Buck	Gerry	Lucas
Butler	Green	McCarran
Byrd	Guffey	McClellan
Capper	Gurney	McFarland
Caraway	Hatch	McKellar

McNary	Radcliffe	Truman
Maloney	Reed	Tunnell
Maybank	Revercomb	Tydings
Mead	Reynolds	Vandenberg
Millikin	Robertson	Van Nuys
Moore	Russell	Wagner
Murdock	Scruggs	Wallgren
Murray	Shipstead	Wheeler
Nye	Smith	Wherry
O'Daniel	Stewart	White
O'Mahoney	Taft	Willis
Overton	Thomas, Okla.	Wilson
Pepper	Thomas, Utah	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 61, after line 17, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 22. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

On page 61, line 13, strike out the figure "22" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "23."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this bill was brought before the Senate on Saturday last, and the amendments which were recommended by the subcommittee and later by the main committee were adopted. It is probable that the bill will not be signed by the President until after the 1st of July. If that should happen, there would be a time gap between the expiration of June 30 and the date when the bill becomes operative. The amendment would close that gap, so that if the bill does not become law promptly on the 1st of July, the beginning of the fiscal year, the appropriations made will be validated from that date and the debts which may be incurred will likewise be validated. That is the reason for the amendment now pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, before any action is taken I think it would be quite appropriate, in view of the history made on Saturday regarding this bill, which carries a stupendous sum, that the able Senator in charge of the bill should attempt at least to justify this enormous expenditure. I realize that the bill has passed the House of Representatives, and there is always necessity, of course, of large expenditures for military purposes during a period of war, but a sum such as \$72,000,000,000 is hardly conceivable in its magnitude, and but few of us have had the opportunity to know what occurred in the committee. I am willing to trust to the judgment of the committee. I took the record home as printed and read it last evening, but I think the Senator should indicate the necessity of expending this mountainous sum of money during the fiscal year. I am not

here opposing it; I am only asking for some justification from the source that is in possession of the knowledge which I seek. I shall have no objection to the amendment which is offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. McNARY. As I have said, I have no objection to the amendment. I think it is quite proper, in view of the lateness of the day as measured by the termination of the fiscal year, and I am willing that the amendment should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma is agreed to.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I want to speak in connection with the amendment which has just been agreed to. I desire the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, this is not just the time, perhaps, for the few remarks I intend to make, but I am compelled to attend a Senate and House conference in a little while, and I desire to make a brief statement in connection with this bill, which, I presume, is the largest appropriation bill in the history of the world. Perhaps it will be a little difficult for the very able chairman of the subcommittee to satisfy the inquiry of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MALONEY. Of course, I do.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. This bill is not so large as the one passed at the last session of Congress. The War Department bill passed at the last session of Congress carried \$72,000,000,000-plus; this one carries only \$71,000,000,000-plus.

Mr. MALONEY. I appreciate the correction. Mr. President, I want to say something on the terrific problem confronting the Appropriations Committee.

I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I want publicly to confess that the work of the committee is much too great for me insofar as obtaining satisfaction is concerned. Members of the Senate know that the Appropriations Committee is divided into subcommittees, and at this particular time of the session, when we are rushing toward the dead line of the fiscal year, two or three subcommittees are meeting at the same time. But even if all the members of the committee were enabled to attend the meetings of the subcommittees, I doubt that we could fully meet the responsibility which is expected of members of the committee.

I have long urged—and it is for this particular purpose that I speak briefly—that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, by legislation if need be,

but certainly in some manner, should obtain the permanent assistance of experts. It has been my suggestion made to the chairman of the committee and the acting chairman of the committee time and time again, that the office of the Comptroller General be requested to send us a staff of experts who would work with the Appropriations Committee all the time. Frankly, we are not able to deal with these tremendous bills, because we all have other necessary work of the Senate to perform; it is impossible to follow the departments throughout the entire year, to study last year's appropriations with great care, and to study the histories of agencies and bureaus and departments insofar as appropriations are concerned. We cannot do it, and every member of the Appropriations Committee I am sure will agree that, to some extent, he is acting on faith, blindly supporting in this very trying period the requests for appropriations submitted by departments, bureaus, and agencies of the Government.

No Senator is going to vote against the very important and tremendous bill with which we are now confronted, but I am certain that there is waste in it; I am certain that there is extravagance in it. The Army does not want waste and extravagance, and, of course, the Appropriations Committee and the Senate do not want waste and extravagance; but we have little choice, for, in the midst of a war, we cannot deny or long delay the request of the Department of War or of the Navy Department or of any other branch of our armed services. I think, however, that we cannot much longer delay, without a great danger of disaster, the acquisition, particularly for the Appropriations Committee, and probably for other committees as well, the permanent assistance of experts.

I have long wanted to make the statement publicly, as I have made it many times in committee, that the committee should have the assistance of experts from the office of the Comptroller General.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I will take but a moment longer to make reference to another all-important subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator leaves the subject he has been discussing will he yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Connecticut that the experience of the Senate Finance Committee in a kindred relationship wholly justifies the thesis he presents, because I doubt whether the Senate Finance Committee could hope effectually to function in respect to the technical phases and the tremendous details of taxation legislation if it were not for the assistance of the permanent staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator from Michigan, and if I had not been

speaking under the compulsion of haste and the need to be elsewhere in a few moments, I should have referred to the Finance Committee as a notable example of what might be done insofar as the Appropriations Committee is concerned. If, as the able Senator from Michigan has just said, the Finance Committee were not supported by experts in the field of taxation, I feel—and I say this with an appreciation of the fact that there are experts on the committee—that the Treasury Department would be writing our tax bills. It is a fact, reluctant as I am to admit it, that to a great extent, the appropriation bills are being written downtown. The tremendous bill which is now pending, insofar as the Senate is concerned—and I say this as a member of the committee—has not been cut one penny. I would not know where to cut it, but I do know, paradoxical as it may sound, that there are instances, many of them, where, with the aid of experts, the bill with which we are now dealing could be reduced to a considerable extent.

I have concluded what I wanted to say about that subject at this time, but there is another matter which is giving me great concern, and has for a long time, and that is the need for care of the civilian population. While we are pouring out these great sums of money for the use of our armed forces—and I always vote "yea" on those bills—I fear we are neglecting to the danger point the civilian population of the country. I have said that time and again on the Senate floor, but I desire respectfully to issue a further word of warning.

I have in my hand a story which appeared in the Washington Star on June 22, written by Miriam Ottenberg. The subject of the article is *Laundries Desperate for Help as Dirty Clothes Pile Up*. That may not excite the interest of many people, but the laundry situation in our country, and particularly in the war areas, is a serious one. It affects the health, in addition to the convenience, of the people. It will affect men and women working in war plants. It is having a damaging effect upon the morale of our people, and this is just one example of what goes on.

We were told some time ago that the civilian supply branch of the War Production Board, given sufficient time, would deal with this subject. That has been repeated to me time and time again by representatives of that branch of the Government. But nothing happens, so far as I can see. In my judgment the situation grows worse. We are approaching a great danger.

I shall not longer delay the Senate upon the matter now. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed as a part of my remarks, and I say to the Senate that unless we are extremely careful and watchful, and do something about it, the forgotten man is coming home.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LAUNDRIES DESPERATE FOR HELP AS DIRTY CLOTHES PILE UP—WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION MAKES RECOMMENDATIONS WHILE MACHINES IDLE AND SERVICE IS CUT

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

While laundry machines stand idle, thousands of Washington residents wait weeks for their shirts, suits, and linens because there aren't enough workers to do the job, a survey of laundries by the Star indicated yesterday.

Even the largest laundries in the Washington area face a further reduction of service and may close entirely, unless immediate steps are taken to provide them with workers.

One laundry reported that if it lost 10 more workers it would have to shut down. The laundry has 2,500 customers.

Another laundry predicted a "precipitous reduction in the amount of laundry that could be handled."

Another called the United States Employment Service yesterday to say that if it didn't get workers immediately it would shut down in 2 hours. A few workers were sent out.

The United States Employment Service is the operating arm of the area War Manpower Commission whose responsibility it is to see that war industries—and the laundries come under that heading—get and keep workers. The area War Manpower Commission, meanwhile, have suggested the laundries ask the War Labor Board to allow wage increases and has sent three men into the plants to find out the causes of absenteeism. It was not until yesterday that the United States Employment Service decided to suggest to domestic workers waiting for jobs that they try the laundries.

The laundries fear the withholding tax will be the last straw. If they can't get wage increases for their workers before the withholding tax takes effect, they fear many of the workers will quit, knowing only that there is less in their pay envelope.

What that will mean in terms of the housewife who has only so much linen or the man who has to have clean shirts to go to work, or the hospitals and restaurants was indicated by the Star survey.

WON'T TAKE NEW CUSTOMERS

Most laundries will take no new customers. One plant hasn't taken a new customer in 10 months. Another turns down 500 new customers a week, 30 customers a day who actually come to the laundry with their bundles of dirty clothes under their arms, and all customers who have used the laundry only once every month or 6 weeks—on the theory that these customers have facilities to do their own washing. That laundry will take servicemen's personal laundry but not that of their families.

Another laundry allows its drivers to accept 4 new customers a week, but only if 4 old customers quit the service. If 10 quit, they can still take only 4, and the new customers can get only "thrifty wash"—unfinished garments.

A number of the laundries have stopped dry cleaning entirely or accept only two garments a week per customer. Others stop the service for 3 to 6 weeks at a time, refuse to take all but current wearing apparel or refuse to take rugs, curtains, drapes and slip covers, hats, gloves, suede and leather jackets, or winter clothing.

NOT ON LONG SCHEDULE

On, or two laundries still return the wash a week after it's picked up, but most of them are on a 10-day to 2-week schedule which sometimes stretches into 3 weeks or a month. A number of them have stopped picking up the laundry for 2 or 3 days a week, which makes the unlucky housewives wait 3 weeks even to have their dirty laundry taken out of the house.

Two weeks' laundry usually isn't twice the size of 1 week's. The housewives in desperation dig some things they must have out of the dirty wash and do the best they can with it at home.

It's a toss-up between taking the garments and household goods that must be washed or cleaned and letting it pile up in the plants, or refusing to take it at all. Laundries have tried both methods, usually choosing the latter after lofts and borrowed space are filled and bundles of clothes and rugs spill onto the floors around the machines. The work has piled up so that a number of plants are limiting the amount they will store.

If you can persuade a laundry to accept the work, you may have to wait a month for a blanket, 5 weeks for curtains, months for rugs and slip covers. Half your work may come back unironed. Some of it is bound to go astray. One laundry reported a 200 percent increase in the errors made by its inexperienced workers. Several laundries said that 5 percent of the linens and garments in the family bundles go to the wrong people or are lost. One laundry said that last week alone, in the flatwork department, 2,600 pieces in family bundles were separated from the bundles and had to be traced and sent out later.

PRODUCTION DROPS SHARPLY

Workers who quit, workers who don't show up two or three times a week, a general shortage of workers explains the story.

One plant has 22 wearing apparel presses. It is using 4. In the washroom of another plant which requires 23 men, yesterday 9 didn't report at all and 4 more walked out at noon. In another plant with 8 shirt units, 2 are usually idle and the teams of workers who used to turn out 125 shirts an hour have been replaced by inexperienced girls who can't do more than 50. Another plant used to finish 4,300 shirts a week. It now turns out 2,500. One laundry had to stop taking white linen suits for a week because it didn't dare.

In the marking room of 1 plant, where the bundles must be given identification marks before they go through the machines, plant supervisors spent a week, working nights, to train 10 new operators. At the end of the week they had 35 girls working. On Monday only 23 reported.

Most plants spend at least an hour in the morning juggling their workers from one department to another so they will have at least a skeleton staff. One plant has installed a public-address system to play music to the workers. The loud speaker is also used to plead with the workers to come back to work the next day.

BONUS SYSTEM TRIED

To get workers and keep them, the laundry owners have tried everything in the book. One plant, with a 10-foot help-wanted sign in front of it, offers its workers a bonus if they will find new employees. Another has been spending \$1,000 a month on advertising to get workers. One laundry even called Gallaudet College for handicapped workers but was told the students all had jobs. Another plant has started sending cards to former employees begging them to return to work.

An attendance bonus is the method used by several plants to cut down absenteeism. Until the gas shortage, one of the plants sent a worker with nursing experience on a round of the homes of girls who hadn't reported for work that day. Another plant asks for an explanation from the absentee workers when they return, if they do return. Some plants, incidentally, have a record of uncalled-for wages. The workers simply disappeared.

An incentive-wage system helps the more experienced workers to almost double their basic wages.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, when the pending bill becomes law, appropriating \$59,034,839,673 for the War Department, and the Navy appropriation bill, already passed by Congress but not as yet signed by the Executive, becomes law, the estimated unexpended balances on July 1, 1943, according to a statement given me by the Treasury Department, available for war expenditures will be \$203,782,009,264, excluding contract authorizations.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator repeat those figures?

Mr. BYRD. On July 1, 1943, the unexpended balances will be \$203,782,009,264. In addition, there are contract authorizations not yet appropriated for amounting to \$24,565,814,717.

Mr. President, this means that on July 1, 1943, more than \$203,000,000,000 will be in the Treasury, appropriated for war purposes, but unexpended, and the war agencies of the Government have authority to make contract authorizations for nearly \$25,000,000,000 more.

From July 1, 1940, to this date our expenditures for war activities have been as follows:

For the fiscal year ending—	
July 1, 1941.....	\$6,301,043,165
July 1, 1942.....	26,011,065,089
July 1, 1943.....	70,219,400,244
Total.....	102,531,508,493

Therefore we will have in unexpended balances more than twice as much as has so far been disbursed for our war activities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I assume, furthermore, that these figures do not include the latitudes available under Government corporations?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct; they do not include the expenditures of the Government corporations.

No Member of Congress is more anxious than I to give every single dollar that is necessary so that we may achieve an early victory in this war. Appropriation bills for war purposes have passed both Houses by a unanimous vote. Every Member of Congress—in the House and Senate—feels, I believe, as I do: That we must provide every single dollar that is necessary. Up to this time the Congress has accepted, practically without change, the estimates presented by the war agencies of the Government, but in view, Mr. President, of the accumulation of these huge unexpended balances, it does seem to me that the time has come when closer scrutiny should be given to the colossal appropriations that are now being made.

We have not as yet reached the level of spending \$100,000,000,000 a year for our war effort. On July 1 we will have sufficient unexpended funds to spend \$100,000,000,000 each year for 2 years, even though Congress does not appropriate one additional dollar. I understand, however, that it is the purpose of the

administration to ask for additional war appropriations during the coming fiscal year. Congress is in almost constant session. It is anxious to appropriate every single dollar necessary to win the war, and an appropriation can be passed in a very short time. Why, then, is it necessary to have unspent balances on hand to the extent of more than \$200,000,000,000?

While it is true that balances are necessary in order to take care of actual obligations and commitments, yet an investigation will, I think, disclose that a very substantial part of this 200 billion unexpended balance is not obligated by contractual commitments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will yield, in that connection I wonder whether we now have a special committee of the Senate which would be authorized to make such an investigation.

Mr. BYRD. I was about to refer to the fact that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures will attempt to make such an investigation and ascertain the facts. I think that after July 1 Congress should be fully informed as to these facts. We must understand that an allocation of funds is entirely different from a commitment, as an allocation can be changed at the pleasure of the Department itself. In fact, practically all these war appropriations are virtually made on a lump-sum basis, and they are subject to a transfer from one purpose to another.

As chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I announce, after consultation with a majority of the members of the committee, that an inquiry will shortly be instituted to ascertain the reason why it is necessary to have \$200,000,000,000 in unexpended balances on hand, in view of the short time required to enact an appropriation for war purposes. This inquiry will cover the field as to the extent these balances have been obligated by actual commitments, the extent to which the funds have been transferred from the purpose covered in the appropriation bill to other purposes, and other details incident to the need for unexpended balances of this magnitude.

Mr. President, the public debt is now approaching \$150,000,000,000. If not a single dollar more were appropriated for our war expenditures, and if we expended the \$200,000,000,000 in unexpended balances in the next 2 years, after deducting the revenue from tax income of about \$35,000,000,000 a year, the public debt would reach \$280,000,000,000 without further appropriations, but we know, of course, that great additional appropriations will be requested in the coming year, so it is not difficult to visualize a debt far in excess of \$300,000,000,000, unless greater care is taken in the expenditure of these public funds.

My investigation and observation have led me to the conclusion that the war expenditures for the production of implements of war and for our war preparations have been unnecessarily extravagant and wasteful. I realize that war is always wasteful, and that we cannot ex-

pect the same efficiency and economy in the preparation for war that we can ordinarily demand in other expenditures of government, but after making allowance for all this, no informed person, I think, can deny that a great opportunity exists for a more economical expenditure of these war disbursements.

As evidence of the confusion that exists in the War Department in relation to its personnel, on June 8 Judge Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, testified before the Ramspeck investigating committee of the House to the effect that the War Department could dismiss 100,000 clerical employees. A few days later the personnel director of the War Department appeared before the Appropriations Committee, asking for 200,000 additional employees. Then Judge Patterson issued a statement saying that those holding positions in the War Department need have no fear that there would be an immediate reduction of any personnel.

This is merely indicative of the general state of confusion that exists in the personnel of the War Department, which, of course, is true also of many other agencies of the Government.

In the civilian personnel alone of the Army and Navy, there is a great opportunity for economy and increased efficiency. In the War and Navy Departments there are 519,438 employees in the clerical category. That is to say that they are classified as performing clerical, administrative, and fiscal services. This does not include a large number of WAVES, WAAC's, and SPARS that are supposed to be doing clerical work. It does not include any personnel in uniform in either the Army or Navy that is performing clerical work.

Not only could great economy be instituted with respect to these employees performing clerical work in the Army and Navy, but there are over 1,200,000 other civilian employees of the Army and Navy, and while many are performing essential war service, by a reorganization of their activities their number could be reduced, resulting in very great savings to the Government.

There is no reason, Mr. President, why all these matters should not come under the scrutiny of Congress in order to keep the war expenditures on the most efficient and economical basis possible, and all this can be done without in any way interfering with the war effort. In fact, it should increase its effectiveness.

At the beginning of the war effort, in view of the necessity for creating a vast organization for these expenditures, there was some reason for waste and extravagance, but now that we have engaged in the war for more than 18 months, it does seem that there could be a more efficient organization to eliminate at least a part of the waste that now exists in these war disbursements.

I am not asking that one single dollar be curtailed that is necessary to win the war as quickly as possible, but I think the Congress and the people have the right to ask that all care and diligence be exercised so that these expenditures will be made with the utmost efficiency and economy. The time has

come when Congress should carefully scrutinize these war expenditures, not for the purpose of creating one single obstacle to the production of the necessary equipment for the efficient prosecution of the war or for any other activity of our war agencies, but to require increased efficiency and greater economy in connection with the colossal expenditures now being made.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on numerous occasions when these stupendous appropriation bills have been under consideration, I have stated that I recognized, as must every other Member of Congress, the necessity, in time of war, of the delegation of power by the legislative arm of the Government to the Executive, but, in my opinion, if Congress delegates any more power than is necessary, it is derelict in its duty. There have been manifestations in recent months that the Congress was concerned about the growth of executive power, and here and there efforts have been made to incorporate in appropriation bills restrictive legislation upon the exercise of executive power. But, Mr. President, when we pass these gigantic appropriation bills and let huge unexpended and unobligated balances pile up, we make a farce of other efforts to curtail or restrict the growth of executive power, for, after all, the great power which the legislative arm of the Government has is the power over the purse strings. I do not hesitate to make the statement that if Congress refuses to appropriate another dollar this war could be carried on for 2 years without any action by Congress. We have permitted the control of the purse strings to be absolutely taken away from us.

Mr. President, I, with every other Senator, acknowledge that we do not wish to take any action which would in anywise hamper the conduct of the war. I think we can search the records of parliamentary bodies in vain to find a better record than that of the present Congress in its support of the war and the unanimity with which the essential war activities have been supported by the Congress. But, Mr. President, it is not wise, it does not add to the efficient conduct of the war, to enable the various Government agencies to escape the scrutiny which they should receive from the Appropriations Committees and from the Members of the House and Senate. They should be required to give a more explicit accounting of the manner in which they have spent these moneys. To do so would, in my opinion, in the end save a burden upon taxpayers amounting to billions of dollars.

Mr. President, when each one of these bills comes before the Senate, brief remarks are made by a few Senators to the effect that the next time it will be different, but it never is any different. Each time these measures go through without proper scrutiny and without a proper accounting being made. We continue piling up billions of dollars in the hopper of the executive branch of the Government, and every time we do that we add to the unnecessary concentration of power in the executive arm of the Government.

I wish to say for the purposes of the record that I think all the other efforts to restrict executive power are futile, so long as we continue to pile up huge appropriations and permit the mounting backlog of billions of dollars which the executive branch of the Government can spend almost as it sees fit.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The fact that these huge appropriations for expenditures are made does not justify us in not attempting to hold down smaller appropriations, does it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was not thinking so much of our effort to curtail appropriations as of the efforts which have been made to restrict executive power, and of all the speeches which are made to the effect that we are going to do this and do that in order to curtail executive power, and then we proceed to pass these huge appropriation bills, and pile up this great backlog, and give away the control of the purse strings, which after all is the only great power which the legislative arm of the Government possesses.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator absolutely, and I want to thank him for his answer to my question; but I should like to ask further, what is the answer to the requests for appropriations which are made to Congress? We are now asked to vote for an appropriation of \$71,000,000,000, without any consideration of the matter on the floor. What is the answer? I want to go along with the war effort. I want to do my part to help do what the senior Senator from Wisconsin wants done. But are we to make the appropriation and then make investigation, or are we to have consideration of the matter first before we pass the bill? I understood the senior Senator from Wisconsin to say that we could continue the war for 1 solid year with the money already appropriated. Is that a correct statement of what the Senator said?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, what I said was a rhetorical statement. I do not have the figures before me of the money Congress has appropriated. Take the backlog of lend-lease, for example, take the backlog of any of these appropriations, and we find that the amount of money which has been piled up is simply staggering.

In answer to the Senator's question I think in part the suggestion made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is the answer. I do not wish the members of the committee or the able Senator in charge of the bill to feel that in anything I have said I wish to single him or his committee out for criticism. I think the Senator from Connecticut has suggested one answer to the problem. I think the Appropriations Committee should have the best permanent staff of experts that it can hire, and as many as it needs. It is penny wise and pound foolish for the Congress to deny itself the necessary assistance in the discharge of

its enormous responsibilities, when we grant practically every request of the executive departments for any assistance which they may require in the discharge of their responsibilities.

Mr. President, I did not intend to go into this subject, but I think Senators should serve on fewer committees. I myself am guilty in that respect. We should serve on fewer committees, so that we may concentrate on the important work of one or two committees.

In my opinion the committee system of the Senate should be reorganized. It should be streamlined. Some of the committees should be reduced in size. Let me say that I have written an article on the subject, for a current magazine. In the article I have tried to set forth some of the things Congress might consider in an effort to reorganize in order to meet the problems of modern society.

To answer more specifically the Senator's question, because no Senator or no Representative wants to be put in the position of hampering the war effort, let me say that I think that in order to make an adequate scrutiny of the appropriations some provision would have to be made to give the Appropriations Committee additional assistants, and perhaps to give it more time, in the consideration of such measures.

I do not wish to be in any wise critical of the branch of Congress at the other end of the Capitol; but, Mr. President, year after year the appropriation bills come to the Senate near the end of the fiscal year, with the result that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate is attempting to deal simultaneously with several appropriation bills. It is fighting against the deadline of the end of the fiscal year. Such a situation puts the Senate committee at a great disadvantage; it makes it necessary for the committee to do its work hastily and under great pressure; and, likewise, it puts the Senate itself at a disadvantage in conference with the House, because the conferees are confronted with the deadline of the fiscal year. I wish the House of Representatives would send the appropriation bills to the Senate earlier, so that more deliberate consideration could be had by the committee and by the Senate, and so that a more satisfactory situation would be created so far as the Senate conferees are concerned in conference with the House.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. TRUMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield, first, to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator how the Finance Committee has gotten along with its additional employees and the additional advice it has obtained from the high-salaried, excellent clerks it has. What is the Senator's judgment on that point?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is my opinion, and I have repeatedly so stated, that neither the able Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives nor the able Finance Committee of the

Senate could successfully handle a tax bill without the assistance of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. By legislation a joint committee was set up and a staff was created. Recently, as I understand, efforts have been made to augment and to strengthen the staff of the joint committee.

If we could have a streamlining and a reorganization of the House and Senate committees, and then could create several joint committee staffs for handling all important pieces or segments of the legislative field in connection with which experts could be of great assistance, I think the work of both the House and the Senate would be improved, and that we would be taking a step in the direction of modernizing the legislative arm of the Government and enabling it better to discharge the tremendously added burden which has come as a result of the war and the industrialization of our society.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say, as a member of the Appropriations Committee and as a member of the subcommittee, that I thoroughly agree with what the Senator from Wisconsin has said, and also with what the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Michigan have said, as to the help which, in my opinion, the Appropriations Committee needs in order to follow through the appropriations from year to year. As a member of the committee and of the subcommittee, I desire to say that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has done a remarkable job in accomplishing what I believe was impossible of accomplishment, when, 2 weeks ago, the \$70,000,000,000 bill was placed in his hands, with the necessity of having it enacted into law by July 1.

So, while commending him for the excellent work he has done, Mr. President, I believe that if we are to handle such matters in a sensible way and for the benefit of the country, nothing better could be done than to do what the distinguished Senator from Connecticut first suggested and as was later suggested by the distinguished Senators from Wisconsin and Michigan.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to repeat that I hope nothing I have said may be construed as a criticism of any member of the Appropriations Committee of either House or of the combined work of those committees, collectively. I am simply discussing the situation. When we stop to think that, so far as I know, with the exception of the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee, since the beginning of the Government, no effort has been made to improve the committee organization and to provide the committees with the necessary staffs, when we consider the tremendous increase in the work which has had to be done, when we consider the tremendous complexity of the problems with which we are con-

fronted, I say that we cannot hope to maintain the status and the station of the legislative arm of the Government unless we have the courage to provide it with the necessary assistants in order that it may be on some measure of equality in dealing with the executive arm of the Government in the important and complicated legislative problems.

Mr. TRUMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, I am not on the Appropriations Committee, and I am rather a new Member of the Senate. I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, in view of what he has said, if what he has said is true, why should we not cut the \$71,000,000,000 appropriation in half and appropriate one-half now, and come back after the recess and appropriate the other half?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, that would be operating on a very important and complex bill with a meat ax. We cannot afford to take such a chance. If such step should be taken, it would have to be taken only after careful consideration and only after the committee became convinced that whatever cut was made would not hinder or hamper the conduct of the war.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I am very anxious to be placed on record as endorsing what the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] have had to say relative to the necessity of the Appropriations Committee having the necessary experts in order to obtain all the facts in connection with the tremendous appropriations which are made. The able and distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has done the job almost singlehanded. I happen to be a member of three or four of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. It is not at all possible for a man to be in three places at once. The special committee which the Senate has authorized, and of which I happen to be the chairman, held some very important meetings while the appropriation hearings were going on. It is not possible for one man, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, to obtain all the facts, as they should be obtained, for the information of the Senate. The only check we have on these expenditures is through the right of appropriating the money and passing the tax bills to raise it.

Last year the War Department came before the Appropriations Committee with an unexpended balance of \$35,000,000,000. An effort was made at that time to cut the appropriation to the point where the \$35,000,000,000 would be a part of the regular appropriation.

The Department came back this year with unexpended balances of \$12,000,000,000. The same procedure should be followed; but, as the Senator from Wisconsin has very aptly stated, we cannot make that sort of a cut with a meat ax.

We must know all the facts, and we must know what we are doing.

We have spent 2½ days arguing as to whether \$48,000,000 should be spent to teach young men to work in war industry plants. Eight or ten years ago, under the same policy, we expended large sums for relief and rehabilitation in the same manner that we are now expending Army and Navy appropriations. There was a great deal of discussion about "boondoggling" in connection with relief appropriations. All the "boondoggling" which was done—if there was any—in connection with relief appropriations could be completely blotted out by only three examples of the way in which the Army and Navy handle appropriations which we give them without any strings attached. They know how to waste money better than any other organization I have ever had anything to do with. They do an excellent job on the waste side.

We changed the construction program from the Quartermaster Department to the Engineer Department of the Army, hoping that the engineers would use their education and their prerogatives to save the tremendous appropriations which we were making. It was the duty of the Special Committee of the Senate to Investigate the National Defense Program to look into the expenditure for camp construction at Camp Blanding, Fla. That was a tremendously wasteful project. Then we had to go to Memphis, Tenn., to look at an ordnance plant, where the waste was even greater than it was at Camp Blanding.

A week or so ago the committee held a hearing in Kansas City in connection with an ordnance plant known as the Sunflower Ordnance Plant, on which it can be conservatively stated that from \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000 was thrown away wastefully, because the checks which the engineers are supposed to make on these expenditures are not made. The engineers claim that they are spread too thin, that there are not enough men of ability to do the job.

Tremendous sums of money are being expended in the manufacture of airplanes, guns, airplane engines, and almost everything else one can imagine. I could stand here all afternoon and give example after example showing that tremendous sums of money are simply being thrown away with a scoop shovel.

In appropriating money for unlimited expenditures, I think the Appropriations Committee of the House and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate ought to have experts in their employ, just as the Finance Committee, which levies taxes to raise the money, has experts.

I have almost become a pessimist in the job which has been given to me. It seems that when public funds are to be expended no one has any interest in what happens to them, no matter what his responsibilities may be under his oath of office. I dislike to make such a statement, but unless this body and the House of Representatives exercise their prerogatives in connection with the purse strings of the Government, much of the

money appropriated will be thrown away for no good purpose whatever. It will not help the war effort. We cannot obstruct this appropriation, because we know that it will be said that we are obstructing the war effort.

I desire to offer an amendment to the pending appropriation bill. If the war should suddenly end before all this money is expended, I think there ought to be a way provided so that the Congress could determine whether or not the remainder of it should be expended. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

Sec.—Notwithstanding any of the other provisions of this act, all appropriations made or contained in this act shall terminate 3 months after the signing of an armistice or agreement for the cessation of hostilities with all the following nations, namely, Germany, Italy, and Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator's amendment apply to the thirty-odd-billion dollars which the Army has transferred to the lend-lease fund under the authorization of Congress? As I understand, \$32,170,000,000 has been transferred from War Department appropriations to the lend-lease fund, of which only \$4,000,000,000 or so has been spent. The expenditure of another \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 during the year is contemplated, leaving more than \$20,000,000,000 which cannot possibly be spent until sometime in the future.

Mr. TRUMAN. It applies to all the money covered by the \$71,000,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. AIKEN. But it would not apply to the thirty-odd-billion dollars which has already been laid away out of the reach of Congress.

Mr. TRUMAN. I am perfectly willing to have it apply to all unexpended balances when the war is over.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator believe that some steps should be taken to recover that money? Although the expenditure of the entire amount was authorized, it was not necessary that the entire \$35,000,000,000 from the War Department and the Navy Department be expended for lend-lease purposes. It seems to me that the transfer was made so as to put more than \$30,000,000,000 out of the reach of Congress.

Mr. TRUMAN. I am perfectly willing to have it included in this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Missouri, or any other Senator who is interested in this question would prepare an amendment which would recover some of that money and put it back where it belongs, and not where it can be spent without the Congress know-

ing for what it is spent, or without its being laid away for future use.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me suggest to both the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Missouri that while it would be in order to place a limitation on the expenditure of an appropriation in a pending bill, any amendment affecting appropriations already made would be legislation, and would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The objective to which the able Senator from Missouri addresses himself is, of course, a sound and appealing one. It is inevitably tied up, however, is it not, with the far larger problem which we shall confront in connection with the liquidation of war contracts when the war is over?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I may borrow the phraseology of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] that is another problem which we cannot handle with a meat axe. It will involve the entire reconversion program of the United States from war back to peace, and it will desperately involve the entire economy of the country during the period of reconversion immediately following the war.

Mr. TRUMAN. It will be a much more difficult problem than was the problem of conversion from peace to war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It will be a far more difficult and delicate problem.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And, unfortunately, it may involve just as much money.

Mr. TRUMAN. Perhaps more.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Obviously, it may involve more time because approximately 70,000 contracts cannot be terminated and liquidated in 3 months. What I am asking the Senator is whether a mere arbitrary shotgun limitation, which would suspend all appropriations 90 days after the cessation of hostilities, might not impinge upon an orderly and judicial settlement of contracts.

Mr. TRUMAN. Will not Congress be in session at that time and will not Congress be able to take the necessary action to meet the situation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, Congress will be in session, and I am quite agreeable to having some arrangement made to meet it; but I was wondering whether the Senator is entirely satisfied with the proposal. I concede his very great experience with this problem because of his very able chairmanship of the committee on investigation over which he so spectacularly presides. I ask him whether he would be satisfied to deal with the matter just off hand, at a moment's notice, without thinking it all the way through. Let me add that I wonder whether the termination of the war is not, unfortunately, still far enough away so that we have the necessary time

to give to the problem the judicial consideration it deserves.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator may be entirely correct. I will say now, however, that if the committee of which I happen to be chairman has had any success whatever it is because of nine able and very distinguished Members of this body who have given me very good advice.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In reply to the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Missouri has suggested that Congress will be in session, and can deal with the matter when it arises.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that would be a valid argument against the Senator's amendment.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator just stated that the matter would require legislative action by both Houses. If the amendment is attached to the bill, the action of the Congress would necessarily be on the basis of the situation as it then appeared, provided the war ended before the money was expended.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me it would have to be on that basis, anyway, regardless of whether an amendment is tied on to the bill. The purpose of the bill is to carry on the expenditures from day after tomorrow until the end of the fiscal year 1944.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. During most of the time the Congress will be in session. It is quite likely that if we have the 2 months' recess which we have been talking about, it will be the only recess we shall have within the next year. So Congress will be in session most of the time.

I am wondering if I may echo the fear expressed by the Senator from Michigan. Congress will be in session, and will be able to deal with the whole subject of conversion and termination of contracts, lend-lease rehabilitation, and all kindred matters that will cost money when the war ends. If we wish to adopt a limitation of 3 months, I wonder whether it would not be better to wait, and to deal with the situation when it arises, rather than to put a stop watch on it now, and perhaps have to set the stop watch ahead considerably when the time comes.

Mr. TRUMAN. We will still have the situation in our hands.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and Congress will be in session, anyway.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In order to terminate the discussion—and I think it will terminate it—I suggest that the amendment is subject to a point of order, and I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that in the form in which the amendment now appears it has the character of a legislative directive, and therefore is subject to a point of order; and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think it is most unfortunate that the point of order has been made against the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. In view of what our distinguished majority leader has stated, I merely wished to suggest that the object and purpose of the amendment, as I understand, is to put all contractors, everyone in the War Department, and all citizens on notice that when the war terminates the contracts will stop, and the expenditures of these moneys will stop. That is about the only thing as to which the amendment would put them on notice, so they could not come here at any time when Congress attempts to end contracts and say that they did not have notice, that they had been left helpless in the situation. The Senator's amendment would put them all on notice.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They could not come in with any excuses of that nature.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is what I had in view when I offered the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I am in sympathy with the purposes back of the amendment which has been introduced and held out of order. However, I would say that such an amendment could not be adopted to the bill in safety. If the amendment should be adopted, within 3 months from the cessation of hostilities all expenditures of the funds appropriated would cease under the law. No payments could be made for any purpose out of any money appropriated in the bill after 90 days following the cessation of hostilities. That would mean that the War Department would have to close in 90 days. It would mean that all our forces abroad, wherever they might be, would have to be brought back to the United States and discharged and returned to their homes within 90 days. Of course, that is unthinkable.

Inasmuch as the amendment has been disposed of by the announcement of the Chair that it is out of order, there is no occasion further to discuss it except to say that it involves a matter of very great importance, and one which, in my opinion, should have the consideration of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, inasmuch as the matter has come into the Record during the afternoon, I should like to add an observation in order to make the Record complete. I am sure the able Senator from Oklahoma knows that the War Department itself has al-

ready instigated very serious and earnest studies of the entire problem of what is to happen to war contracts at the conclusion of the war. The same subject is being very intimately investigated by the Treasury Department as well as by several other departments of the Government. The subject is not being ignored. On the contrary, it is receiving very prayerful consideration because, obviously, there will be a terrific issue.

The necessity will be that the answer strikes an appropriate balance between maximum economy, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, adequate assurance of the swiftest possible national transition to a peacetime economy.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan.

I wish to make some reference to the report which was made by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. As I recall his figures, he made a statement that there now is in excess of \$200,000,000 of unexpended balances. An unexpended balance is different from an unallocated balance. I ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia how much in the way of unallocated balances we have at the present time, if he has the figures available.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, that is information which we have not been able to obtain. There is an unallocated balance and there is also an uncommitted balance, and the two are entirely different. The committed balances are those under which contracts have been made. To say that there are allocated balances of funds means that the funds have been allocated for specific purposes, and that the purposes for which the allocations have been made can be changed at will. We have been unable to obtain that information. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that the figures given have been obtained from the Treasury Department. After making allowance for all the bills which have been passed and signed, and including the pending one, plus the balances already on hand, there will be \$203,782,009,264 available for war purposes, as unexpended balances.

The extent to which the funds have been allocated or committed is most difficult to ascertain. Allocation means nothing. Funds may be allocated for battleships and then spent for something else. When they are committed by contractual obligations, of course, that is a different matter. I have been unable to obtain information as to unexpended balances.

I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to the fact that, as I previously explained to him, the figures are not for the War Department alone, but include all the balances in the Treasury for war purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, from the statement by the junior Senator from Virginia, I gained the impression that the figures he gave related to the War Department.

Mr. BYRD. No; if the Senator will read what I said, he will find that I very clearly said that they related to

all balances in the Treasury for war purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then the first point of clearance is that the statement made refers to all agencies of the Government. That is No. 1.

Mr. BYRD. All war agencies.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a fund can be considered in three groups. First, we take the unexpended funds in the Treasury. Such funds may fall under three possible classifications, first, the funds may be free, unallotted, and unobligated; second, the funds may be allocated but not obligated by contract; and, third, such funds may be obligated by contract and held ready for payment on such contract. The Treasury always has vast sums against which checks have been issued but which have not been cleared. It is not proper to say that because the Treasury has funds in its coffers the money has not been obligated. If the money has been obligated, it means that contracts have been made for the expenditure of such funds. The Government makes contracts for the purchase of supplies, but payment is not made until the article purchased has been delivered, tested, approved, and accepted. Then the payment is made. So it may be that the Treasury has millions or billions of dollars which have not been actually paid out as yet, but the contracts have been made, and the goods are being prepared though they have not been delivered, and have not been inspected and approved. So the fact that the Treasury has a very large sum does not mean that the money has not been allocated or contracted for.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, would the Senator give the information to the Senate as to how much of this fund has been placed under contract? He is on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The information we had before the committee shows that \$12,500,000,000 appropriated heretofore by Congress for the War Department have not as yet been allocated. That means there have been no contracts made for the sum of \$12,500,000,000. All the balance has been placed under contract, and the goods are in process of manufacture.

Mr. BYRD. Does not the Senator make a distinction between allocations and commitments for contracts? Allocation means to allot a certain amount of money to be spent for a certain purpose, say, for the construction of battleships, but that does not become an obligation until a contract has been made.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator is exactly correct. The Bureau of the Budget sets up the allocations every year. The Budget Bureau sends to Congress, through the President, the allocations of funds requested. Then, if the funds are appropriated, they are appropriated as per the allocations set forth by the Budget. There is an allocation when the moneys are appropriated. They are already allocated, but it remains for the contract to be made under the allocation.

Mr. BYRD. I understand as to that, but funds can be allocated without having contracts made. The point I wish to make is that there is a distinct difference between an obligation, which is a commitment made by contractual obligation, and an allocation. An allocation simply means that the department, in its own right, allocates certain funds, for example, to battleships, airplanes, or something else. Until they are contracted for, the allocations may be changed. It is entirely different. I have in my hand a statement and I should like to have the Senator say whether it is correct in respect to the War Department, which shows there were unobligated balances in the War Department of \$22,562,000,000 on June 1, 1943. I will ask the Senator if that is correct. That does not include the bill which is now under consideration.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the information before the committee was to the effect that the Department has \$12,500,000,000 unallocated and uncontracted and that amount of money is carried by the bill as a reappropriation.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Was it not our understanding in the committee that the twelve and a half billion dollars of unallocated money was the amount which would not be allocated as of June 30, 1943?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. The figures of the Senator from Virginia were for a date 30 days prior to the date when the twelve and a half billion would be unallocated.

Mr. BYRD. My figures were as of June 1, 1943.

Mr. GURNEY. That is right.

Mr. BYRD. These figures, I may say, came from the Appropriations Committee, and I assume they are correct. They show unobligated balances in War Department funds of \$22,562,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Government operates on the basis of a fiscal year beginning on July 1 and ending June 30. The figures placed before the committee were of date June 30, which will be tomorrow, and tomorrow night, at midnight, our information is that the War Department will have twelve and a half billion dollars approximately of unallocated and unobligated money. The pending bill seeks to reappropriate, and when passed it will reappropriate, that twelve and a half billion dollars. This bill carries, Mr. President, \$59,000,000,000 of new money together with twelve and a half billion odd thousand dollars, which makes a total of seventy-one and a half billion

dollars. The bill of last year carried for this year's use \$42,820,000,000, with a \$29,000,000,000 carry-over for last year.

The Congress, however, did not appropriate that in the supply bill 2 years ago; it was the residue of numerous deficiency bills.

Before the War Department or any other department can make a contract, it must either have an appropriation or a contract authorization by law. No department of the Government can contract for any sort of services or goods unless it has either the money or a right under the law to make a contract. In the first days of this war, when we were in our preparatory stages, the War Department had to have money before it could contract; so Congress was very liberal in making appropriations by way of deficiencies. But the bill last year, as I have said, carried \$42,820,000,000 of new money and twenty-nine-billion-and-some-odd-million dollars of reappropriations, which made the appropriation bill for the current fiscal year which was passed last year total \$72,000,000,000. This bill is a little smaller and totals only seventy-one and a half billion dollars.

Mr. President, the money appropriated in the first part of this war was for purposes of preparation, very largely for construction of camps, the building of ordnance plants, powder plants, shell-loading plants, and facilities of that character. Those sums totaled quite a large amount. Those expenditures are practically over. This bill carries about half a billion dollars for the expansion of existing plants and for the building of new plants, very largely for hospital construction.

I realize that these appropriations are enormous, but when we consider the low state of the War Department when this war struck, perhaps we can understand more fully why so much money has been required.

When this war began in 1939 we had a Regular Army of less than 200,000 men, and a National Guard of 200,000 men, making a total, National Guard and Regular Army, officers and all, of about 400,000. At that time we had not built a battleship, a matter which, of course, comes under the Navy, for about 20 years; we had not made a rifle since World War No. 1. All the rifles we had were the old Springfield single-shot rifles or Enfield single-shot rifles and Krag Jorgensens, which were used in the Spanish-American War. We had scarcely built a machine gun, except for experimental purposes. We had not built an antitank gun; we had not built an anti-aircraft gun, it may be said, for 20 years. The cannon we had, the field pieces, were those we got from France in 1919. After the first World War was over, in an adjustment with France, we gave France certain supplies, and took over 3,500 French 75 millimeter cannon. Those cannon had wooden wheels; they had wooden hubs, wooden spokes, wooden

felloes and steel tires. One of those cannon pulled behind a caterpillar tractor down the road would not last a mile.

The committee of the Senate tried to provide money with which to modernize those cannon, under Senator Copeland, at that time chairman of the subcommittee. An effort was made to provide money to put rubber tires on these cannon so that they could be taken out on the road, or in the field, and put in such shape that they could travel 12, 15, 20, 25, 30, or 40 miles an hour, as they must travel in modern warfare. We did not succeed in providing the money for that purpose. We did provide some money to experiment with rubber tires on cannon. At the time this war began, only a few cannon were equipped with rubber tires. Now they all have rubber tires.

We tried to provide some money with which to build anti-aircraft guns, away back yonder under Senator Copeland. At one time we had only 45 anti-aircraft guns in the entire Military Establishment of the United States. We tried to provide some money with which to build more anti-aircraft guns, and the Senate said, "No, you cannot have money to put rubber tires on cannon, you cannot have money with which to build new anti-aircraft guns, because war is over, war is a thing of the past. We solved that question in World War No. 1, and when we won in World War No. 1, wars were a thing of history. We are not going to have any more war."

We acted in the way I have narrated and as a result our regular Military Establishment declined to 113,000 enlisted personnel, which is all we had in 1929. I think that in 1930 the number was slightly increased.

Mr. President, I can understand why the Congress would not build battleships, and would not put rubber tires on cannon, and would not build anti-aircraft guns, and insisted on keeping the antiquated rifles then in use. I can understand that. The people had been educated to believe that wars were a thing of the past, that there would be no more war. Therefore, if there would be no future need for rifles and cannon and anti-aircraft guns, why spend the money in building them? The people had good reason to entertain that thought, because they had been taught to believe that that was the situation.

After World War No. 1 was over a plan was proposed for solving international problems. The plan was brought before the Senate, and, after debate lasting many months, it was rejected; the League of Nations was not adhered to by the American Senate. So the first plan for solving international difficulties and problems was a failure.

Shortly thereafter, under a new administration, it was proposed that a general disarmament conference be held. Mr. Harding, then President, or his Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, suggested the disarmament conference. The two of them called a general, world-wide disarmament conference.

The conference was held in Washington. We took the lead in the disarmament program, and as a result an agreement was reached whereby Great Britain and the United States should be on a parity, and Japan should be at a substantial disparity, and other nations should have practically nothing. As the result we again thought, the world having disarmed, and America having taken the lead, that there would be no more war; so we would sink our ships and cease military activities, and America would live up to the program.

Later, under Mr. Coolidge, there was another program for disarmament which led people to believe there would be no more war. Mr. Coolidge suggested that the nations of the world get together and renounce war as a national policy. Under the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact practically all nations of the world reached such an agreement, and we thought again that the world was still sane, and that war was a thing of the past.

Mr. President, that was not all. After the present administration came into power, there was put into effect what is termed the "good neighbor policy." We thought we would lead the world to the good neighbor policy not only on the North American Continent, but in the Western Hemisphere, and throughout the world.

It was because of the acts I have mentioned that the people understood we would have no more international difficulties, and that there was no occasion to build a big navy or a big army or a big air force. That was the condition in which we found ourselves in the early thirties.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I have just entered the Chamber and heard the Senator's recitation of history, which is accurate in part only. He seems to lay all the blame on the Congress for the necessity of providing the huge sum of money called for in the pending bill, and says that Congress is responsible for not having the foresight he now has himself.

I served here during the time mentioned, during the consideration of the League of Nations and the Kellogg-Briand pact, and all the years between then and now, and every day of all those years Congress has been fully abreast of the situation, even ahead of the administrations of the War and Navy Departments. I could cite instances of Congress going forward and seeking to build up the national defense, when there was no unified effort on the part of the War and Navy establishments, or the administration, to go along with Congress.

I may have misconceived the Senator's statement, but, if anyone who served here all those years tells me that we are responsible for these huge appropriations and for not having sufficient foresight, but dealt wholly with hindsight, I

say he does not understand the history of the country or know what occurred in this Chamber and in the one at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. President, I did not complain about the pending bill. I have tried to be helpful in permitting it to come up today. I know there has been much wastage in connection with the war effort. No doubt, the committee has done the best it could, but it has not the facilities or the personnel intelligently to inquire into the need for all these expenditures, and I have not criticized the committee, because I am a Member of this body and I should have given more attention to it. But I stand here to defend this body, and the Congress as a whole, and all the Congresses which have gone before since the last war, against a charge of dereliction of duty and lack of farsightedness and common prudence.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I was attempting to give a little history and my interpretation of it to show why our Military Establishment had been permitted to reach such a low ebb.

Mr. McNARY. I understood that thoroughly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McNARY. I beg pardon. I should have addressed the Chair. I am conscious that the rules so provide.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I accurately stated my views. If the Senator wishes to lug in, using his own judgment, a lot of what is not, in my opinion, accurate history, to the effect that Congress is chargeable with all the things which have occurred in the past, I say that every administration which has been in power since the last war, irrespective of political domination, and every Congress, every Secretary of War, and every Secretary of State and all the personnel of the departments, have been equally guilty, if such a word may be used.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I take no exception to the statements made by the Senator from Oregon. I am showing as best I can why we went down to the bottom of the barrel. When the present war began we had practically no Army, not very much of a Navy, and practically no Air Force. We had a few airplanes, but most of them were not equipped with ordnance, and when we got into the war, second-hand, through the lend-lease program back of England, and began to shoot down some of the foreign planes, we found that the foreign planes were in three particulars better than the American planes. We found that the foreign planes had leakless gas tanks. It was possible to shoot through those tanks with a machine gun, and the tanks would not leak. We had no American plane with a leakless gas tank. That was inferiority No. 1.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. What the Senator has said is true. Almost all the planes we had when we entered the war were not fit for overseas service. Some did not have sufficient fire power. Some did not have the self-sealing gasoline tanks. Some of them were not equipped with armor plates. I could not quite understand why the War Department did not order placed in the planes which were then being built these three essential items necessary for overseas fighting. Subsequently our planes were provided with all three. The fact that planes were built without these three essential items was not the fault of Congress. The Congress appropriated the money and when planes were built it was a question for the War Department to decide whether they should contain self-sealing gasoline tanks, sufficient fire power, and proper armor plate. Whose responsibility was that? Congress appropriated the money, but the War Department ordered the building of the planes.

Mr. President, it will be remembered that Secretary of War Stimson said early in the war that we had approximately 4,000 planes which were fit for overseas service. Notwithstanding that statement, I was reliably informed that we did not have a single solitary plane fit for overseas service, because our planes were not equipped with these three essential items.

I was criticized for making a statement to that effect, but when I wrote a letter to the Secretary asking him if the figures which I gave with respect to the number of our planes which were fit for overseas duty were substantially correct, I received no answer.

When the War Department gave out the statement to the effect that we had 4,000 planes fit for overseas service, the truth is we did not have a single, solitary plane which at that time was equipped with all three of the essential items which the military experts said were necessary for overseas duty. It was not the fault of Congress that we did not have efficient planes. Someone in the War Department was to blame, because in ordering the planes built the three items—self-sealing gasoline tanks, protective armor plate, and sufficient fire power—were not included.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator from Montana for his statement, which reinforces my argument that when we began the war we did not have very much in the way of planes fit for overseas service.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Secondly, our planes were deficient in the matter of armor plate around the pilot. When we began to shoot down the planes of our enemies we found that the pilot was surrounded by armor plate so thick and so tough that an ordinary rifle bullet or machine-gun bullet would not pierce it. Our planes were not so equipped.

In the third place, we found that the planes we shot down had larger and more powerful machine guns than those placed

in our planes. So we had to rebuild our planes after the war began. That meant that we had to start from the ground. That is the reason the war has cost us so much money to date.

We started without proper information, without properly trained men, and, of course, without money. The reason we did not have the money necessary for building proper equipment and munitions is a simple one. The people back home would not permit their Senators and Representatives to vote huge sums to construct battleships, to build planes and cannon, or to put rubber tires on second-hand cannon, or to make new rifles. Why? Because they had been educated to the belief that there would be no more war, and since they believed there would be no more war, why should the Government spend multiplied millions of dollars to build up a great military establishment.

Mr. President, I am not criticizing the Senate, neither am I criticizing the other House of Congress. I am simply giving for the Record, as I understand, the condition which underlies the failure of the Congress to act, which was because the people back home would not permit their Representatives in the Congress to act. Representatives in Congress must go home every 2 years to report to their constituents, and every 6 years Senators must answer to their constituents at the polls.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The situation which the Senator describes as prevailing in this country is one which prevailed in all the democracies. As a matter of fact, when attacked, even those closest to the scene of the danger were not ready. France thought she was ready because she had the Maginot Line, but she was not ready. England had no Maginot Line, but she had the English Channel between her and her enemies. But neither England nor France were ready, although the danger of attack upon Europe was imminent from almost the very day that Hitler took power in Germany in 1933.

The democracies of Europe did not want war. Their people did not want war. Because they did not want war they did not believe there was going to be war. The fact that all the nations, as the Senator said a while ago, had signed treaties outlawing war, abolishing war as an instrument of national policy, led the people to believe that there would be no more war, because they believed in the sincerity of the governments, 65 or more of them, which had signed the various treaties which would abolish war. It was not strange that the people believed there would be no more war. Their governments had done everything possible, as they thought, to guard against future wars by means of treaties which were signed. There were many kinds of treaties signed, not only the Kellogg-Briand Pact, but the Locarno-Nine Power pact and all the others of them. Without intending to lull the

people into a sense of false security, what had happened in the international field had lulled them into a feeling of security because they thought war had been abolished.

Some of the nations that signed the treaties abolishing war, including Germany, Japan, and Italy, proceeded secretly to prepare for a war which they were planning to bring on, and it took a long time for the people in the democracies to wake up to the situation.

What happened in this country was no different, except in degree, from that which happened in all the democracies. It has always been an amazing thing to me that the nations in Europe which lean right up against Germany, seeing what was going on in Germany, did not prepare adequately to meet the danger they faced, but it was, I think, because the people of those nations—and that is also true of the people of this country—felt that if there was going to be no more war—a condition which had been guaranteed, so they felt by the signing of various nonwar treaties—there was no need to spend billions of dollars in preparation for something they hoped and believed would not happen.

Mr. President, it may be that that is the fault of democracies. It may be that no democracy can always be ready, armed to the teeth, and in all likelihood it could be said that if a country were armed to the teeth, ready for war, it would not be a democracy. Therefore such a situation has its compensations. No political party is to blame, no administration is to blame, no particular branch of the Government is to blame. It is a condition which existed among the peoples of all the free nations of the world, because they did not want war, they did not want to believe there would be war, and therefore they did not get ready for it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I concur in what the Senator from Kentucky has stated, and thank him for his contribution to the discussion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is another compensation which I think should be mentioned. I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma in his statement that we started from scratch, but I say it was a good thing we did start from scratch, because had we spent hundreds of billions of dollars in building tanks, guns, and other equipment used in warfare, we would have been compelled to junk everything we had prepared, because everything we then built would today be obsolete. Everything we had at that time is today obsolete. We are not now building any such guns as we would have built in 1938 or 1939. We are not now building any such planes as we would have built at that time. The planes built at that time are today ab-

solutely obsolete. The same thing is true with respect to tanks. As a matter of fact only recently we changed the type of tanks being built so that they would not be obsolescent.

Had we spent two or three hundred billion dollars in building equipment, munitions, and supplies, all we could do with them today would be to junk them. We could not use them in this war. So it has been a very fortunate thing that we started from scratch.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Let me remind the Senate that notwithstanding the fact that the United States is a great peace-loving country, we have had on the average a war every 25 years since the country was formed. The United States was born in revolution, in 1776, when we engaged in the first war on a large scale. After the Nation had been formed we thought we were through with war, but that was a fallacy. Not 25 years thereafter we were engaged in a war, the War of 1812. That was not our last war. In 1845 we had the Mexican War. That was not our last war. Then we had the War between the States in the sixties. Then 25 years after that we were engaged in the Spanish-American War, in 1898. Then almost 25 years ago we were engaged in World War No. 1, and now in 1943 we have been engaged for almost 2 years in another World War.

Every 25 years this country has found itself in a conflict. Naturally, I am hopeful that the present one will be the last. Twenty-five years ago our people believed World War No. 1 would be the last one. As I tried to say a while ago, the reason why we were not prepared was because of the conviction among the people that wars were a thing of the past, and that the world had so progressed in civilization that if international troubles did come a way would be found to settle them without resort to arms.

Mr. President, the pending bill appropriates a great deal of money. I am not sure that I am prepared to answer all the questions which might be propounded relative to it.

The appropriations fall into different categories. A few days ago the Senate passed the Navy appropriation bill providing \$24,000,000,000 for the purchase, among other things, of 27,000 airplanes. The pending bill provides for the purchase of 100,000 airplanes. Of course, the planes are very expensive. The largest single item in the bill is that for the purchase of the 100,000 airplanes, which will cost an estimated sum of \$20,600,000,000. That itself is a very large amount.

The next largest item in the bill is for the Ordnance Department, which amounts to about \$15,000,000,000. Of the \$15,000,000,000, \$3,000,000,000 is for the purchase of ammunition, alone. That is a very considerable sum.

Then, of course, the bill carries smaller amounts. I shall discuss these very briefly.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question relative to ammunition?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. I was very much interested in reading in the newspapers the other day that in 1 hour's time our forces dropped on the Island of Pantelleria a greater tonnage of bombs than the Japs dropped on Corregidor during the entire 6 months of the siege of Corregidor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator for his suggestion.

Mr. HILL. Of course, as the Senator knows, it did not take 6 months to take the Island of Pantelleria.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, of course, those in charge of our war effort are attempting to do all they can to bring the war to a conclusion by means of the use of airplanes, because that weapon is the most powerful and the least expensive, both in manpower and money, which can be used.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the evidence before the committee disclose the number of planes we are actually making each year?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to know how many planes we are making. Can the Senator give me that information?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The number of planes built last year totaled approximately 60,000. That was an average of 5,000 a month.

We are now making planes at the rate of 7,000 a month. Next month the rate will be 8,000; and by the end of the year it will be approximately 11,000 or 12,000 a month.

Mr. LUCAS. I presume that includes all types and kinds of airplanes; does it?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct. We are making three principal types of planes: Fighter planes, bomber planes, and transport planes. The bill carries an appropriation for the building of 100,000 planes, and that number is divided into 38,000 fighter planes, 36,000 bombers, and 21,000 transport planes, at a total cost of \$20,600,000,000, or an average cost of \$200,000 each. Of course, the small, fast fighter planes do not cost that much; they are comparatively cheap. The enormous four-engine planes cost up into the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. McNARY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, and then to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LUCAS. When the Senator makes the statement that we shall produce 8,000 planes next month, does he mean that the planes will be complete in every detail and will be ready to take off, providing we can find the pilots to fly them?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes. We are training the pilots, and we have the pilots available as fast as the planes are brought into production. The programs are going along uniformly, and there is no bottleneck now with regard to either the making of planes or the training of pilots. The program is in a satisfactory condition.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator, because I was interested in the matter of completion of the planes. There was a rumor sometime ago to the effect that, while we were producing at the rate of, let us say, 8,000 planes a month, yet somewhere along the line there were bottlenecks which were preventing the completion of the planes before they were ready to fly, either as fighter, bomber, or transport planes. I am glad that is not true. As I understand, the Senator's statement is that it is not true.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct, in the main. I shall have to qualify the statement slightly. There is the complaint that some of the men in the factories are not so busy as they might be, that they are smoking cigarettes and are sitting and standing around without anything to do. Occasionally that happens. A factory making planes is organized, and one group will be doing one thing on the planes, and another group will be doing something else on the planes, and each man is a specialist in his own line. A number of the factories depend upon parts coming in for the planes. If, for example, some of the electrical gadgets are not available for the planes, the crew that installs such gadgets has nothing to do until the parts are available. Not knowing when the parts will arrive, the management keeps the men there so that when the parts do arrive the men may be assigned to the task of installing them. Occasionally, men are not kept busy because of the fact that the parts have not yet reached the plant.

I am glad to yield now to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator is discussing the cost of planes, will he place in the Record or will he state at this time the cost of a flying fortress?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator have the information available for the Record at this time?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; I do not. The cost of a Flying Fortress varies from time to time. Flying Fortresses are becoming cheaper. I will say, because of better facilities of production.

Mr. McNARY. I had the impression, probably formed some months ago, that a Flying Fortress cost approximately half a million dollars. Is that figure in the vicinity of the actual cost?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; that is approximately correct. The reason why the planes cost so much is that when a plane is made, it immediately is out of date. Whenever a plane is completed, it might be said that it is almost out of date, because after its manufacture has

been started and completed, the engineers have advanced ideas and improvements, so that the next plane or the next number of planes which are made, embody improvements which make the planes previously completed second-rate, we might say. The factories are making larger planes, more efficient planes, with planes more powerful and faster engines and with heavier ordnance—the cannon and guns. Some of the planes carry guns that shoot a 3-inch shell. Not many of them do, and they may not be really efficient but, nevertheless, the planes are now carrying larger cannon.

The Finance Service of the Army will receive, out of the appropriation carried in the bill, approximately \$12,800,000,000. That is to pay the officers and enlisted personnel their salaries.

The food for the Army for the next year will cost an estimated \$2,500,000,000. That is at an estimated rate of 72 cents a day a man for subsistence.

The bill carries for the item of clothing the sum of approximately \$2,250,000,000. For the item of transportation an appropriation of \$1,500,000,000 is made.

Mr. President, I may state for the Record that in the Army there are now approximately 7,000,000 men. By the end of the present year, if our plans do not miscarry, the Army will total 8,200,000 men, which is the maximum size to which it is planned to build up the Army. Of course, from then on the question will be purely one of maintenance. That is the size to which the military authorities want to develop the Army, and from then on the question will be one of keeping the Army as near that size as possible. It is thought that an Army of that size can do the job which must be done.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the Senator repeat the figure he just stated, because it is interesting. He referred to the number of men the Army has agreed upon as the maximum.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. By the end of 1943 we shall have in the armed forces, on the Army side, which embraces the Air Corps, 8,200,000 men.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that that figure is for the Army alone?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. For the Army and the Air Corps.

Mr. LUCAS. For both the Army and the Air Corps; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that that is the maximum number of men the Army feels it can obtain and efficiently equip and operate, so far as the total population of the country is concerned?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is the judgment of those in authority with respect to the size of the Army, which embraces the ground forces and the Air Corps. The figure is 8,200,000. If we add to that the Navy, which embraces the Marines and the Coast Guard, the total is a little less than 11,000,000. That is the total of the armed forces expected to be in service at the end of the present calendar year.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the figure 8,200,000 is the over-all figure for the Army, including both enlisted personnel and officers. There will be about seven and a half million enlisted personnel, and the remainder will be officers.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is true. It also includes the Women's Auxiliary, called the WAAC. It is planned, if possible, to increase that organization to 150,000.

Mr. HILL. It now numbers about 60,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It now numbers a little more than 45,000. It is being rapidly expanded, and it is hoped that it may be increased to 150,000 by the end of the calendar year.

Mr. President, I believe that completes what I have to say. I wish to place in the RECORD at this point a statement showing the enlisted strength of the Army from the year 1930 to the present time.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement of War Department appropriations

Fiscal year	Requested by War Department	Approved by the Bureau of the Budget	Appropriated by Congress		
			War Department military appropriations	Emergency funds and other allocations	Total
1930.....	\$349,986,426	\$328,727,164	\$332,114,899	\$332,114,899
1931.....	362,382,069	347,299,185	346,979,179	346,979,179
1932.....	351,304,294	343,170,810	338,920,916	338,920,916
1933.....	331,243,753	316,195,110	304,961,492	304,961,492
1934.....	277,509,874	277,746,841	277,066,381	\$85,062,913	362,129,294
1935.....	265,271,321	285,000,155	280,862,084	12,471,801	293,333,885
1936.....	361,351,154	331,647,277	355,538,104	18,778,058	374,316,262
1937.....	467,022,415	385,288,153	388,244,859	27,866,583	416,111,442
1938.....	459,656,768	419,208,326	417,985,029	60,353,707	478,338,736
1939.....	597,622,768	545,143,122	531,001,997	120,220,196	651,222,193
1940.....	915,318,325	839,322,260	851,618,610	49,514,672	901,133,282

Total military appropriations:

Fiscal year:

1941..... \$8,480,594,407

1942..... 75,462,593,587

Contract authorizations:

1941..... 5,006,589,651

1942..... 183,145,695

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Will the Senator include in the RECORD a full statement, showing not only appropriations, but the amounts requested, and the amounts approved by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes. That is in the printed statement. The statement which I have put in the RECORD shows the three items.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I find from that statement that the Congress has approved appropriations practically equal to the total requested by the War Department in the 10 years, 1930 to 1940. Congress could not be as well informed about what was needed for armaments as was the Army; but this record shows that Congress responded very well to the requests of the Army. So it cannot be said that Congress was not diligent in voting the funds.

Enlisted strength of the Army

Fiscal year	Authorized	Actual
1930.....	125,195	124,301
1931.....	125,195	125,407
1932.....	125,195	119,913
1933.....	125,195	121,788
1934.....	125,195	123,823
1935.....	125,165	125,098
1936.....	171,415	153,212
1937.....	171,415	164,993
1938.....	168,415	170,151
1939.....	171,415	174,079
1940.....	245,413	249,441
1941.....	1,500,000	1,361,658
1942.....	3,100,000	2,000,000
1943.....	7,000,000	16,500,000
1944.....	7,533,000	17,533,000

¹ Approximate.

The figures for the fiscal years 1930 to 1941, inclusive, include Philippine Scouts.

The figures for the fiscal years 1942 to 1944, inclusive, are based on average figures and are exclusive of Philippine Scouts.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Following that, I desire to place in the RECORD a statement showing the appropriations made for the support of the Army, beginning with the year 1930 and ending with the pending bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

have acquired the British Fleet. With the British Fleet, the German Fleet, the Italian Fleet, and the French Fleet, it could have moved across to Canada. Canada had no defense whatever. With bases in Canada, and with her well-equipped war machine, Germany could have moved down on the United States. At that time we had practically no defense. We could not have defended ourselves, and could not have prevented annihilation and eventual capture. In all probability that would have meant that the German flag would have been flying over America long before this. That is item No. 1.

When Japan attacked Pearl Harbor 80 percent of the fighting power of the Pacific Fleet was destroyed or put out of commission. If Japan had known what she could have done at Pearl Harbor, and had had her fleet in the ocean a few miles away from Pearl Harbor, she could have moved in. Our planes in Hawaii were practically all destroyed. There would have been no defense from planes, and no defense from ships, because 80 percent of our ships were out of commission. With our Pacific Fleet out of commission, and no planes in that area, Hawaii would have fallen. Japan could have taken Hawaii, used it as a base, and moved across the Pacific to our western coast, where we had little defense. The Japanese flag might have been flying in America long before this.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. In the discussion of this military bill, nothing has been said about the Navy, except some rather vague allusions. If the Senator has no objection, I should like to put some figures into the RECORD at this point. They may be of interest.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have no objection.

Mr. BONE. The Navy has not been starved for appropriations. In 1933 there was made available to the Navy an appropriation of \$334,427,692; in 1934, \$572,834,079; in 1935, \$371,507,137; in 1936, \$498,565,826; in 1937, \$559,134,532; in 1938, \$558,207,435; in 1939, the year the war began, the Congress made available to the Navy \$656,883,908; in 1940, the year following the declaration of war, Congress made available to the Navy \$1,050,149,570. The total for 1941 was \$5,366,021,065; for 1942, \$26,235,661,843. The appropriations for the current fiscal year are \$25,800,188,519; and the proposed appropriation for 1944 is \$29,434,787,198.

It will be recalled that the Vinson-Trammell Act was before this body in 1934. The Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, and Senators and Members of the House generally, were keenly aware of some of the implications of the Hitler movement in Europe, so we began to step up the tempo so far as Naval construction was concerned. If the building is not what it should have been, certainly Congress was exceedingly generous with the Navy in the matter of dollars and cents.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I think the Senator is correct in his analysis of the situation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have before me the total of the appropriations for the 10 years. The total is approximately four and a half billion dollars. There ought to have been some money for airplanes in that sum.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Until the war broke out in Europe in 1939 this country was not much interested in military activities. Even after the war broke out in Europe, still we were not very much interested. It took Pearl Harbor to arouse America to the situation.

I think it might be well at this point to place in the RECORD the statement that on two occasions we came to the verge of annihilation. If Germany had followed through at Dunkerque; if Germany had had some ships to follow the evacuation of the British Army across the channel, and had moved across the channel, England would have had practically no defense. In the opinion of many, England would have fallen. If England had fallen in the spring of 1940, Germany could have acquired the French Fleet. No doubt it could also

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the able Senator from Washington if he has any figures from 1928 to 1932, showing what appropriations were made for the Navy.

Mr. BONE. No. I sought from the Department only the figures from 1933 on, dating from the accession of Hitler.

Mr. LUCAS. It would be very interesting to include those figures, because when the present President of the United States came into office in 1933 he immediately began to build up our Navy to treaty strength. It will be found that the appropriations for naval purposes for 6 or 8 years previous to that time were limited, to say the least.

Mr. BONE. Very much so.

Mr. LUCAS. Whatever amounts were appropriated by the Congress from 1932 on were for the purpose of building our Navy up to treaty strength in line with what we had agreed on in respect to the 6-6-3 ratio with England and Japan. In my humble opinion it was very fortunate that we had a President who really had at heart the interests of the Navy, and thoroughly understood the Hitler movement in Europe. I do not mean to cast any reflection on anyone in previous administrations with respect to building up the Navy, but we know that little or nothing was done about it for a number of years. The situation was as the Senator from Oklahoma described it a moment ago; the people of the country did not want anything done. They had the notion that we were to live here in a sort of sublime state for the remainder of our existence without any war. We had been led to believe that. After the last war we all said that we did not want to have anything to do with European nations because of their greed, their racial antipathies, and their centuries of fighting among themselves. That is the reason why a spirit of almost helplessness grew up in this country during that particular time. I desired to call that situation to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. BONE. With the indulgence of the Senator from Oklahoma, let me say that the Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will first yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. Appropriations for the Navy had not been extensive in the years preceding 1933 because of the feeling that the world would not suddenly go crazy. Upon the accession of Mr. Roosevelt to the Presidency of the United States, and upon the accession of Hitler to power in Germany, we entered upon a new phase of human existence. The record will indicate that in 1934, out of N. I. R. A. allotments the President—doubtless moved by what was happening in Europe—lifted in excess of \$277,000,000 and put it into the custody of the Navy with the view of building up the Navy.

One more thing which might be of interest is that the last battleship which we built was the *West Virginia*, a ship of approximately 35,000 tons, a very fine fighting ship. It was one of those which were knocked around pretty badly at Pearl Harbor. It cost approximately \$26,800,000.

Oddly enough, it was finished at a time when wages were high in the shipyards. As I recall, steel was even higher per ton than it has been during the present building period, and yet, due to technological changes, better propelling machinery, different fire control, and fighting equipment, the cost of new ships in the same category has risen to sixty or seventy million dollars. I find no explanation for it anywhere, but that condition exists.

When we consider that the *West Virginia*, which was finished in 1923, 10 years before Hitler came into power, cost \$26,000,000, we can realize that with the allocation of \$277,000,000 which was made by President Roosevelt, along with other appropriations made available by Congress, we should have been able to begin a tremendous expansion of the Navy. So far as I can recall, that is what occurred. The Navy has gone steadily up, and we should have the largest Navy in the world. With the program indicated by these figures, if we do not demonstrate to the world the capacity of our Navy to dominate the seas, there is something wrong with America.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Oklahoma stated a moment ago that it was estimated that by the end of this year the Army would have 8,200,000 officers and enlisted men. Appreciating the fact that it must be increased by approximately a million to make that possible, several questions were brought out in the committee in connection with the pay of dependents.

There is now pending before the Military Affairs Committee a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts to increase such pay. The question was asked as to what is now being paid to dependents. It may interest the Senate to know that in the hearings it was revealed that of the over-all total of \$12,264,510,000 required for the Finance Service of the Army, \$11,512,374,665, or 93.87 percent, represents the subappropriation "Pay of the Army"; \$720,000,000, or 5.87 percent is for travel; and \$32,136,000, or 0.26 percent, is for the remaining miscellaneous items. The total for payment of allowances to dependents of enlisted men is \$1,216,559,760. That information was given in answer to a question by the Senator from Massachusetts.

A further question was asked by myself as to whether that could be broken down on a family basis. The statement was made that the War Department is now sending out 3,300,000 checks a month. All of them are not to family

dependents, but a large number of them are for family dependents.

The March 1943 figures show that the Government's share of the average check was \$29.28; the enlisted man's share was \$23.29, making a total of \$52.57.

For April the Government's share of the average check was \$30.20; the enlisted man's share was \$23.60, or a total of \$53.80.

For May, the latest figures available, the Government's share of the average check was \$28.14; the enlisted man's share was \$22.47, or a total family allowance of \$50.61.

In short, the average pay for the enlisted man, his relatives and family, half of which he pays himself, is only \$50 a month.

I appreciate the fact that this is an appropriation bill and that no legislative amendment would be in order. I hope I shall have the pleasure, as a Member of the Senate, to vote to increase the allowance, because with the present high cost of living, the families left at home are receiving only \$50 a month, and I do not think that is sufficient.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. In the statement which was made by the Senator a few moments ago, I do not believe he intended to blame Congress for what happened at Pearl Harbor. He said that if the Japs had known it, they could have taken Pearl Harbor. Congress was not to blame for what took place at Pearl Harbor. The Secretary of the Navy made the statement, in a magazine article which was published after Pearl Harbor, that the Navy was ready to fight on the seven seas. We certainly had planes and a navy at Pearl Harbor.

I am not trying to blame any particular person, because I do not know who was to blame for what took place at Pearl Harbor. But certainly someone was to blame for what occurred there, and it was not the Congress of the United States. A great many persons have attempted to blame Congress for what took place at Pearl Harbor. It is ridiculous to try to do so. Someone in the Army, the Navy, or the executive department of the Government was to blame for what took place there.

Even though the Japs had taken the Hawaiian Islands I do not believe that they could have taken the United States. Nor do I believe for one moment that we would have been captured or that the German flag would have been flown over the United States even if Britain had collapsed. The fact is that Britain did not collapse. We must take into consideration many "ifs" and "ands." The German military forces did not cross the English Channel. I have talked with Englishmen and with some of our own military experts. They do not all agree. Some of them think that possibly the Germans could have taken England if they had attempted it. But apparently Hitler did not think he could, because he

did not attempt to take it. But we certainly have not been able to cross the English Channel, and there are many military experts, both in this country and elsewhere, who think it would be impossible for us to cross the English Channel at this time.

With reference to our not being prepared, as the Senator has said by the time an airplane is completed it is almost obsolete because of improvements which have been made in the planes of England, Japan, and Germany. Probably it is not so true of appropriations for the Navy, but if we had appropriated to build more planes, more guns, and other equipment of that kind, the planes and guns would all have been obsolete by 1940, 1941, or 1942. As has been pointed out here, it was demonstrated very clearly that the first tanks which we built and sent to north Africa did not stand up, but went to pieces because they were riveted, and so improved tanks had to be devised.

It was not the fault, in my judgment, of the Congress of the United States. It was not any more the fault of the Republican administration than it was of the Democratic administration, or the fault of the Republicans any more than the fault of Democrats. During my 20 years' service here I think the Congress has been giving to the executive departments practically every single dollar of appropriations they have asked for the Army and for the Navy. At times the Committee on Appropriations, I think, has offered to provide appropriations in excess of those the executive department has requested. Let me ask the Senator from Oklahoma if that is not a fact with reference to some appropriations during the last few years?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if I may at this point place a little incident in the RECORD it might be of some value.

When the appropriations were being prepared during the spring of 1940 the House passed a bill which in due course came before the Senate committee. As chairman of the subcommittee, I was holding hearings on that measure. The President had submitted his request for money to the House, as he always does. The House, even after the war had broken out in Europe in 1939, had slashed the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget very severely. I cannot be accurate in stating the percentage, but the reduction in the bill which came before the Senate in the spring of 1940 was 10 or 15 or 20 percent. At that time, along the latter part of May 1940, we were having difficulty in the Senate committee in the effort to restore the cuts made by the House. The Members of the House made those cuts because they believed that their people back home did not want large appropriations made. The President had asked for additional funds, though not for any great amount of additional funds, but the House said "No." The bill came to the Senate in that shape. The bill was before my committee when the Germans made their drive against the Allied line, drove the left flank toward Paris, and the right flank toward Dun-

querque, and broke through there. That all happened over the week end. Immediately after the Dunkerque debacle had taken place, the sentiment in the committee and the sentiment of the country changed entirely. Immediately we began to receive letters and telegrams and long-distance calls and editorials asking why we did not build up a big Navy and a big Army and a big Air Corps to meet what might come.

That is the way democracy works. The subcommittee went ahead, held hearings, and agreed to restore the items cut from the bill by the House. But, after that had happened, the subcommittee was not satisfied with the appropriations asked for by the War Department and requested by the Bureau of the Budget. So, in executive session, my subcommittee went into the matter and brought before the committee General Marshall and other high-ranking officials of the War Department and asked them if, in view of the emergency, they thought they were asking for all the money they needed.

Of course, there is a rule that an official of the administration cannot ask for money that is not requested and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. So, they were estopped; they could not say that they wanted any more money. We took the lid off, and, in effect, asked the officials of the War Department to hold a conference and bring us back a confidential memorandum stating to the committee how much money they thought the Congress should appropriate in order to give them the money necessary to build up the Army and the Air Corps. We took a recess. The officials advised us that they would be ready to report in a few days. Evidently—I do not know this to be a fact, but evidently General Marshall and his staff took the matter to the President, because in 2 or 3 days we had notice that the President would address a joint meeting of the House and the Senate. The President came before the joint meeting, delivered his address, and asked for appropriations \$2,000,000,000 in excess of the Budget estimates which had been considered by the House and the Senate subcommittee. The President appeared before the joint session of the two bodies, as I recall, on Thursday at 1 o'clock. The subcommittee met that afternoon. We had the break-down of the \$2,000,000,000 before us. We considered the break-down during Friday and Saturday. On Saturday afternoon we wrote up the bill and reported it to the Senate on Monday.

The bill, which was passed on Tuesday following the President's address to the joint meeting, restored the cuts made by the House and appropriated in excess of \$2,000,000,000 new money. The House immediately accepted the action of the Senate. That is when the Army started building up. Up to that time it was going along in a very slow manner. I think that it is proper to place that statement in the RECORD to demonstrate that when an emergency arises a democracy can function and can do it quickly, as has been proven many times in the past.

I wish to say to the Senator from Montana that I have not thought of blaming

Congress or any individual Senator. I blame, if it may be called blame, the conditions which then prevailed. The people thought they were through with war; they thought it foolish to build up an Army and Navy and Air Corps, on the theory that if we built up a large Military Establishment the time would come when we would want to try it out to see if it was good. In the springtime when we see boys on the sandlots playing baseball, we know that they will organize a team and challenge some team on the other side of the tracks. In the fall when we see boys on the sandlots practicing football we know, as a matter of course, that very shortly they will become organized into teams and challenge other football teams. So the people believed that if we built up a big Army and a big Navy and a big Air Corps we would be building up for a purpose, and that, sooner or later, we would want to try them out. For that reason they were not willing to build up a large Military Establishment, and, for that reason, they counseled with their Representatives and Senators against the appropriation of large sums of money for military purposes.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say, if I may interrupt the Senator again—

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I think any Member of the Senate who was here during the period between 1922 and 1932 who will examine his correspondence and files will find to be true exactly what the Senator from Oklahoma has said. In the matter of appropriating money for the Army and Navy he will find that his mail was largely made up of propaganda from peace organizations, church organizations, labor organizations, and individuals protesting against building up a big Navy and a big Army. As the Senator indicates, the mass of the people of this country, if we may judge by the letters received from various States and various organizations, were opposed to building a big Navy and a big Army because they felt if we built them up we would set up a military regime here or would want to use them in order to try them out.

Of course, that has been the history of a great many countries. Hitler had a large army, and was permitted to build a big army. He was put in power and financed by the same people he is attacking today. Hitler was built up, and everyone who knows anything about the matter knows he was built up and kept in power by the financial interests of Germany. He was encouraged by some of the financial interests in England, and by some of the financial interests in France, because they wanted him in power to suppress what they called the Communist movement in Germany, and as a buffer against communism in Russia. The financial interests were the ones responsible for putting him in power, after Laval, who was then head of the French Government, recalled the money the French had in Vienna and in Austrian banks, and broke the banks. They did not want the Anschluss between Germany and Austria, thinking that if it

were brought about there would then be a coalition, and that France would be subject to attack by both Austria and Germany under the leadership of Hitler. That broke the banks. Instead of hurting Hitler, it tended to increase his power, and after that took place, and to a large extent directly because of that fact, he went into power.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator. The suggestion was made a moment ago that someone was in great error at Pearl Harbor. Let me suggest as a possible explanation that warfare has changed from what it used to be. Warfare and prize fighting are almost Siamese twins. Prize fighters do not meet on the street or in secret places and begin to fight. One challenges the other, and after the challenge has been accepted, they meet and sign terms. Then they agree on the time and place when they will meet and put on the contest. That is the way nations heretofore have begun wars. They would become involved in a contest back and forth, reach a point where they could go no further without fighting, then recall their representatives, and declare war, and both nations would begin to prepare for the actual conflict. Later on, when they became prepared, they would go on the battlefield, and begin to fight the case out.

Times have changed, as was demonstrated at Pearl Harbor, because all remember that at the time we were still in conference, trying to solve some of our problems, we were attacked on that Sunday morning in the Hawaiian Islands. The attack might have been made on Washington on that morning, just as well as at Pearl Harbor, and had the attack been made on Washington, or New York City, or San Francisco, or

Los Angeles, the condition would have been the same; we would not have been prepared for an attack. So, while a mistake was made at Pearl Harbor, I am not prepared to condemn anyone because of dereliction of duty. It happened as it did because no one was expecting war to break without some notice, and we had no notice.

Mr. President, I ask permission to place in the RECORD in connection with my remarks the brief report of the committee in explanation and in justification of the pending bill.

There being no objection, the report (No. 357) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

Amount of bills as passed House and reported to Senate.....	\$59,034,839,673.00
Amount of regular estimates for 1944.....	\$59,425,586,500.00
Amount of appropriations, 1943.....	42,820,006,365.47
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Under the estimates for 1944.....	390,746,327.00
Exceeds the appropriations for 1943.....	16,214,833,307.53

¹ Together with reappropriations amounting to \$12,472,839,200.

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATIONS AND REAPPROPRIATIONS

A statement of the appropriations and reappropriations by services, showing amounts of cash requirements, carry-overs, and total requirements follows:

	Cash requirement	Carry-over	Total requirement
Contingencies of the Army.....	\$22,142,000		\$22,142,000
Expediting production.....	557,011,000	456,147,000	1,013,158,000
Contingent fund, Chief of Staff.....	100	128,000,000	128,000,100
Special field exercises.....	77,000,000	10,000,000	87,000,000
Army War College.....	124,000		124,000
Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.....	145,000		145,000
Finance Service, Army.....	12,264,510,665		12,264,510,665
Quartermaster Corps and Transportation Corps.....	6,411,549,008	1,100,000,000	7,511,549,008
Signal Service of the Army.....	4,646,168,600	600,000,000	5,246,168,600
Air Corps, Army.....	23,655,481,000		23,655,481,000
Medical and Hospital Department.....	446,212,000	173,791,000	620,003,000
Engineer Service, Army.....	2,472,401,500	1,520,000,000	3,992,401,500
Ordnance Department.....	7,992,577,000	7,050,000,000	15,042,577,000
Chemical Warfare Service, Army.....	240,025,000	812,474,000	1,052,499,000
Special service schools.....	1,711,000	100,000	1,811,000
Instruction in armored force activities.....	580,000	89,000	669,000
Coast defense, general.....	29,632,000	5,930,000	35,562,000
U. S. Military Academy.....	5,981,000		5,981,000
National Guard.....	100	64,500	64,600
Organized Reserves.....	100	9,500	9,600
Reserve Officers' Training Corps.....	2,125,000	1,200,000	3,325,000
Promotion of rifle practice.....	100	45,000	45,000
Army of the Philippines.....	100	205,987,000	205,987,000
Inter-American relations.....	500,000		500,000
Departmental activities.....	8,964,000		8,964,000
Total.....	59,034,839,673	12,472,839,200	71,507,678,873

ARMY AIR FORCES

Over 87 percent of the \$23,700,000,000 budget of the Army Air Forces is required for the procurement of airplanes, spare engines, spare parts, and other miscellaneous procurement expenses. This sum will permit production to continue at the maximum rate, which the airplane industry is expected to reach soon after the end of the calendar year.

In addition to these costs which come directly under the Air Corps appropriation, a total of \$4,700,000,000 is requested for the new airplane program under other military appropriation titles in the bill. This appropriation will provide 38,000 bombers, 38,000 fighters, 12,000 air transports, and 9,000 trainers with all the necessary spare engines and spare parts.

In the next year, the program of the Air Corps should reach maturity. Another 6 months should see maximum plane production reached. Already the training program has started to level off.

The big task of the Air Transport Command in establishing the necessary airfields, acquiring the personnel to service the planes, and facilities to house and feed the personnel is nearing completion. The Air Transport Command is now operating 90,000 miles of air routes over which they are ferrying planes from the factories to their destination overseas. Personnel and strategic materials are flowing in a constantly increasing stream to the theaters of operation.

While the aviation program in general is moving forward at a very satisfactory rate, certain phases, such as aviation gasoline, still present difficult problems. Production of 100-octane gasoline must be increased to keep up with the rapid expansion in demand. With 70 percent of the Army Air Forces gasoline requirements calling for high-octane gas, great effort will be necessary to keep supply up to demand. The public probably does not realize the enormous rate of gasoline consumption by the air forces. An air force raid on Berlin by 500 heavy bombers from the British Isles consumes more than 800,000 gallons of gasoline. The transportation of this gasoline to the theaters of operation is in itself a major problem.

FINANCE SERVICE, ARMY

A total of \$12,264,510,665 is carried in this bill under "Finance Service, Army." The 2 major items covered are pay and allowances of some 8,200,000 military personnel, and travel of the Army, which together account for 93.4 percent of the total appropriation. The remaining 1.6 percent provides for the salaries of civilian employees at military headquarters and field employees of the Finance Department, personal allowances and compensation for work of enemy prisoners of war, settlement of various claims, expenses of courts martial, and miscellaneous items.

In the absence of a request by the War Department, no action was taken to restore the 10-percent cut in funds for travel in the bill as passed by the House.

Funds for the payment of family allowances to dependents of enlisted men of the last four grades are included in this appropriation. The committee is particularly interested in this subject.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

As passed by the House and as reported to the Senate, the bill includes a total of approximately \$230,000,000 for the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. This is based on a strength of 150,000, of whom 10,000 would be officers. No consideration has been given to a possible increase in the corps over this figure.

It is the intention of the War Department, gradually to substitute female for male enlisted personnel, wherever feasible. The results to date demonstrate that the organization of such a group of women, thoroughly trained to replace male personnel needed in other war activities, has passed beyond the experimental stage.

QUARMASTER CORPS

Of the supplies and transportation gross requirements of seven and five-tenths billions, some one and six-tenths billions are for rail and water transportation, discussed below under Transportation Corps, making \$5,900,000,000 available for obligation by the Quartermaster Corps. This amount reflects two and five-tenths billions for feeding the Army, two and three-tenths for clothing and equipment, and one and one-tenth billions for supplies, equipment, animals, and incidental expenses.

As presented in these estimates, the cost of the delivered ration is figured at 72 cents, including raw food costs of 61 cents, plus amounts necessary to cover transportation, special types of rations, and the special packaging required by diverse climatic conditions. At this time last year the corresponding figures were approximately 66 cents and 56 cents, respectively.

Determined that the armed forces shall have all food, clothing, general supplies, and equipment, essential for the prosecution of a global war, the Quartermaster Corps is steering a skillful course in its procurement of the thousands of items included in this program, many of which are fraught with public interest because of the impact of rationing, price subsidies, and roll-backs. Improvements, resulting from continuous research and development work, are being made on the rations, clothing, and equipment issued to our troops, as reports of actual battle conditions are received from theaters in every climate.

TRANSPORTATION CORPS

"Army transportation, water" requires approximately \$500,000,000, of which, roughly, one-third is for procurement of boats, engines, and pier equipment, and the balance is for operation. Small-boat procurement covers combat and training craft, harbor-defense craft, rescue and salvage craft, and supply craft. The largest item is for supply boats which are used to transport supplies from advanced water bases to the forward lines. The greater part of the operating expenditures is for operation of boats and shore facilities. This covers wages to crews and the operation of the ports of embarkation. Stevedoring is also a major expense. In some theaters of operation stevedoring is furnished as an item of reverse lend-lease.

"Army transportation, commercial" is estimated at \$1,000,000,000, of which \$770,000,000 is for the transportation of supplies. The railroads have done such an unusually good job of moving men and materials during this war that none of the congestion which we had in the First World War has occurred to date. This is in spite of the fact that the railroads are moving men and materials in far larger amounts than in the previous war. About six times the volume of freight was moved overseas during the first year of this war compared with the first year of the last war. Yet in moving this freight to the ports the railroads operated with 20,000 fewer locomotives. In addition to the shipment of supplies in this country, the Transportation Corps has to ship rolling stock and operate railroads in the various theaters of operation.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The estimates for "Engineer Service, Army" provide for nearly \$4,000,000,000, of which \$1,530,000,000 represents a carry-over from the 1943 appropriation.

In addition to procurement of equipment and supplies for use in active theaters, new construction in the continental United States, on a reduced basis, and expansion and conversion of existing structures and facilities, these funds provide for the continuation and expansion of engineer work in the active theaters of operation.

The committee reviewed in considerable detail the experience of the Corps of Engineers relating to the use or acquisition of real estate, in view of the fact that certain taxing bodies such as school districts are affected by loss of tax income by Federal acquisition of real property.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

The bill provides for the Ordnance Department the sum of \$7,992,577,000 under the appropriation, "Ordnance service and supplies, Army," and \$55,000 under the appropriation, "Rock Island Bridge." Likewise, it is also reappropriating an unobligated balance of

\$7,050,000,000, thus providing a total of \$15,042,577,000 for the operation of the Ordnance Department during the coming fiscal year.

One of the large items included under the Ordnance Department is \$3,889,431,984 for international aid. These funds will be used to purchase guns, trucks, and ammunition for the United Nations, and are a substantial contribution to our allies.

In addition, the Ordnance estimates include the sum of \$2,800,000,000 for maintenance and procurement of motor vehicles, a new function which it just recently took over from the Quartermaster Corps. The Ordnance Department also procures all the necessary armament for our own forces, as well as for our allies. Some of the items that it procures in large volumes are tanks, jeeps, motortrucks, cannon, machine guns, carbines, and many miscellaneous weapons. The appropriation also contains an item of \$80,960,000 for research and development.

SIGNAL SERVICE, ARMY

The Signal Service of the Army handles all communication equipment and facilities. The amount provided for this Service for the coming fiscal year is \$5,546,168,000, of which \$900,000,000 is a reappropriation. Within this substantial program, the sum of \$3,659,473,705 is to be devoted to Army Air Force requirements. Among the various types of items provided for the Army Air Forces are air-borne and air-ground equipment, together with the operation of meteorological stations, Army airway stations, and aircraft warning systems.

One of the major items in the estimates of the Signal Corps is for construction of new telephone systems, new radio systems, and new aircraft warning systems which, however, show a reduction of approximately \$140,000,000 as compared with the estimates for the fiscal year 1943. It indicates that the Army has passed the peak of its requirements for these fixed systems. However, the maintenance program calls for a substantial increase brought about by the necessity of maintaining all communication systems which were installed in the fiscal years 1942 and 1943, while the Signal Corps was attaining its peak of construction.

The Signal Corps likewise has made progress in its research and development in connection with radio and radar, and is constantly endeavoring to improve its equipment in every respect.

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE, ARMY

The appropriation of new funds for the Chemical Warfare Service amounts to \$340,025,000. In addition, the 1943 unobligated balance of \$812,474,000 is reappropriated.

Full-scale production of chemical agents and defensive matériel is a reality. Adequate stocks are on hand for immediate use in the eventuality of an all-out gas warfare initiated by our enemies.

The incendiary bomb has become one of the most important munitions presently used by our Air Forces. Testimony reveals that this munition now constitutes a major portion by weight of a bomber load. A large portion of the funds made available for this service is intended for the development and more extensive use of this weapon.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT

The health record of the Army to date presents a challenge which is being accepted in an aggressive spirit by the office of the Surgeon General. The program contemplated for the fiscal year 1944, requiring a total of \$600,000,000, of which \$173,791,000 is a reappropriation, includes over 700,000 general and station hospital beds to be operated here and overseas, as well as the procurement for our own Army and our allies, of some \$440,000,000 worth of medical supplies and equipment.

The Medical Department has also associated itself actively with the problem of maintaining a flow of qualified students into the medical schools to the end that the performance of the Surgeon General's mission may rest in competent hands.

EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

While the war effort is reaching maturity as far as production facilities are concerned, certain expenditures are still necessary for the expansion of plant facilities, the conversion of existing plants to other types of production, and the acquisition and lease of special machinery. For those purposes, \$1,222,158,000 is required for the fiscal year 1944. Of this amount recommended by the committee, \$657,011,000 is appropriated in the bill, and \$565,147,000 is provided as a reappropriation of unobligated prior fiscal year funds. Approximately \$313,000,000 is for machine tools for Allied Nations, and about three-fourths of the balance will be used for ordnance production.

The allocation of the amount recommended for the fiscal year 1944 is as follows:

Army Air Forces.....	\$190,000,000
Ordnance Service and Supplies.....	962,758,000
Signal Service, Army.....	20,000,000
Chemical Warfare Service.....	37,100,000
Transportation Corps.....	2,300,000
Total.....	1,222,158,000

LEND-LEASE

Exclusive of airplanes, spare engines, and spare parts to be furnished by the Army Air Forces as the strategic situation demands the military estimates for the fiscal year 1944 contain a total of \$4,969,967,668 for lend-lease. This amount is distributed as follows:

Air Corps, Army (training)....	\$37,637,080
Chemical Warfare Service.....	55,739,272
Engineer Service, Army.....	203,530,806
Medical and Hospital Department.....	68,219,040
Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army.....	3,889,431,984
Signal Service, Army.....	366,010,624
Supplies and transportation, Army.....	349,398,862
Army.....	349,398,862

The total value of articles and services actually turned over or rendered to our allies by the War Department through April 30, 1943, was \$4,717,324,391. Of this amount, \$1,350,298,210 represents item and services furnished or rendered by the Army Air Forces, principally aircraft, while the remaining \$3,367,026,181 involved goods and services furnished by the supply services.

There has been certain reciprocity, known as reverse lend-lease or reciprocal aid, whereby our allies, to the extent of their ability, make available to our forces in the field supplies, facilities, and services on a reciprocal basis. The bill takes into account and deducts reciprocal aid of about \$220,000,000, which it is contemplated will be furnished during the fiscal year 1944.

LIMITATIONS

The changes in the bill recommended by the committee are as follows:

Expediting production:

The committee recommend that the following proviso be stricken from the bill: "Provided further, That section 403 (a) of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act (Public, 528, 77th Cong., 2d sess.), as amended, is further amended to include the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation, and to provide that the term 'Department' also shall mean the Defense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation, respectively, and, in the case of such corporations, that the term 'Secretary' also shall mean the De-

fense Plant Corporation and the Defense Supplies Corporation, respectively."

Finance Department: Finance Service, Army: Pay of the Army:

The committee recommend that the following proviso be stricken from the bill: "Provided further, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for obligation or expenditure or for any expense whatsoever, directly or indirectly, for or on account of any person in a civilian status listed as a conscientious objector, pursuant to the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (except as may be incident to induction into the Army of the United States), including compensation of military and civilian personnel, transportation on any kind of conveyance belonging to or operated by or at the expense of the War Department, and instruction, education, or training of any kind."

Quartermaster Corps and Transportation Corps:

The committee recommend that the following proviso be stricken from the bill: "Provided, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for payment to or expenditure on account of any military or civilian personnel employed outside continental United States to paint or otherwise reproduce war scenes except by means of photography, or to paint portraits, or for payment to or expenditure on account of any military personnel within continental United States who engage in decorative art projects or painting portraits to the exclusion of regular military duties."

(In recommending the deletion of this proviso, the committee calls attention to the fact that the matter involved is one of policy which should be passed upon by the proper legislative committees.)

The committee recommend that the following proviso be stricken from the bill: "Provided, That appropriations in this Act which are available for any expenses incident to educating persons in medicine (including veterinary) or dentistry shall be available only when such persons can complete instruction in degree-granting colleges or universities as students in such professions within two years, provided also that such students must be enlisted in the Army of the United States."

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BONE. The observations of the Senator about what transpired at Pearl Harbor lead me to inquire regarding a matter about which the able Senator from Oklahoma may be able to enlighten us. I have been advised, whether correctly or incorrectly I do not know, that unless specific charges are made by the Army and Navy against the men commanding our military and naval forces at Pearl Harbor, within a certain specified length of time, by virtue of a statute of limitations, the charges will come to repose, and those men will never be brought before a court martial. Can the Senator advise us whether that is the fact? We are passing today probably the largest appropriation in human history. I cudgel my memory, and I can recall no civilized government which ever appropriated in one lump sum such an astounding, staggering sum as that provided in the pending bill, which we are about to pass with a handful of Senators present. The amount appropriated by the bill represents almost two and one-half times the entire cost of our participation in the World War.

I happened to think in connection with the imminent passage of the bill, of the charges against the two men who were at the head of our Army and Navy in Hawaii, and I wonder if the Senator can tell me whether my suspicions with respect to the statute of limitations are correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I regret to say that I am not able to answer the question asked by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, while the pending appropriation bill is before the Senate, I believe it would be appropriate to make a few observations concerning rioting which may require the attention of the military, articles about which have appeared in the press all too frequently of late, and which recently found its climax in the city of Detroit.

Before I make further reference to it, I wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee who is handling the pending measure for the very capable manner in which he has held the hearings, presented his case to the full committee, and is now presenting his arguments to the Senate.

Mr. President, the recent racial disorders which culminated in pitched battles between bizarre zoot-suiters and our servicemen on the west coast, and which reached a climax in Detroit, where it was necessary to call out the troops to quell civil insurrection, are a national disgrace. We should hang our heads in shame at our own negligence in permitting this dangerous development to spread beyond control.

As one of two original signatories to the Atlantic Charter, we proclaimed to the world our dedication to the broad principles of humanity and justice enunciated in that document of liberty. Immediately after our entry into the war we became mutually bound with the other members of the United Nations to help each other in our common cause.

The "four freedoms" are the keystone of our compact. In their name we have turned our national economy into the arsenal of democracy; in their name our flag is flying the seven seas, from the bleak shores of the Arctic Ocean to the southern rim of the globe; in their name we have trained and equipped and sent forth to battle the largest Army and Navy in our history.

In the name of those same four freedoms we share in the heroic stand of the Russian people, and hope to benefit by the flood tide of Russian victory when she sweeps the beaten armies of Hitler from out of her territories.

The magnificent struggle of the people of China, and the sacrifices which her men and women have made in the name of the four freedoms, against the military might of an invading army which has laid waste vast areas of her homeland, are an inspiration to all men, everywhere. We look to the colored races of Asia and Africa for support in this struggle of the democracies for survival. Without their wholehearted and complete support we cannot win. They have rallied to the banners of freedom.

They, too, have pledged their all in this fight for freedom.

It cannot be denied that we have trifled with our chances for victory by the complacency with which we have countenanced the spread of racial differences in our midst. This complacency must be supplanted by vigilance. This indifference must be replaced by serious concern; by righteous indignation and alarm at distrust and hatreds which undermine our whole national structure, and which can bring about its ultimate collapse. They are calculated to create chaos and confusion at a time when our very existence as a nation depends upon our unity. While I am removed from the scenes of these disorders, and have no information from official sources as to their origin, I abhor the untimely occurrences of these manifestations of an alarming degree of disunity, which must bring sorrow to the patriotic people of our Nation, and at the same time bring joy and satisfaction to the propagandists of the enemy.

With morale in the Axis countries at a low ebb, and the experts prophesying the termination of the war by the end of the year, these outbreaks and clashes amongst our people give added stimulus to the propaganda chiefs in Japan and Germany. The stimulus thus provided to our enemy can possibly give them the necessary comfort and confidence to rouse their people to superhuman efforts in order to prolong the war. That is most unfortunate.

These disturbances bear all of the familiar marks of subversive activity by Hitler's agents. The results certainly could not be more disastrous to our cause if they were personally directed by Hitler himself. This internal strife is part of the Nazi announced plan for subjection of the world—a softening up process by which the strength which should be employed against the Nazi is dissipated by internal strife. Thus we have the sorry spectacle of our own armed soldiers marching in the streets of Detroit to protect the lives of American citizens and the safety of American property, and our own people lie wounded and dead victims of our own guns.

The full strength of our armed forces is needed on the battle fronts in foreign lands that we may keep our shores inviolate, that we may bring about an early victory. The energy and sacrifice which is expended in keeping order at home should be added to that being made in engagements against the enemy on the battlefronts of the world. It would shorten the war; it would help overcome our enemies and bring our boys home at an earlier date. Our boys on the battle fronts should command our every ounce of energy.

These pictures of American soldiers with drawn bayonets preserving order on the streets of an American city are of inestimable value to the enemy. That is what troubles me.

We can be sure that the enemy propaganda agents are spreading accounts and pictures among the very people to whom we must look for assistance, portraying these riots and bloodshed, as an

example of unrest and dissatisfaction among the American people.

Our cause is just. We of the United Nations have pledged our all for the liberation and freedom of the common man. Freedom from want and freedom from fear must be attained at home if we are to wage war successfully for those ideals abroad. Our own people, all of them, of every race, color and creed, must have an abiding faith in our dedication to the spiritual ideal that all humanity is one, and that when the victory is achieved, there will be no bitterness, no hatred, no enslavement nor persecution of any man because of his race, color or creed. We must convince our own people that we are sincere when we repeat with the immortal Lincoln, the creed which inspired our founding fathers, "All men are created equal."

It is the sacred duty of responsible leaders in all walks of life, particularly the leaders of religion, of labor and of industry, as well as our public officials to turn our people from these paths of hatred and differences to the paths of friendship and unity. It is obligatory on us to show the futility of strife and how it injures our Nation's cause, and helps the cause of Berlin and Tokyo.

The watchword of the hour is unity, because it is only through unity that we can forge the links of victory. It is only through victory that the ideals of the "four freedoms" can become a reality here in the United States. Victory for the enemy means slavery for all of us.

Let us therefore put forth every effort for the highest possible degree of national unity. To do less would be to neglect our fighting battalions on democracy's far-flung battle fronts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, this appropriation has included in it the sum of \$205,000,000 for the organization and maintenance of the Philippine Army.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The appropriation covers all the money required to take care of our entire Army Establishment. The item in question is carried to take care of the Army of the Philippines just as soon as the islands are freed of Japanese domination.

Mr. BUCK. There is an item of \$205,000,000 in it for the Philippine Army. Is that simply a carry-over?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The sum was appropriated to maintain the Army of the Philippines and will be carried in each bill until such time as the Philippines are free again, so that at that time the funds will be available to rehabilitate and maintain the Army.

Mr. BUCK. There is no mention of that item in the bill that I find. There is set forth in the bill the appropriation of \$100. The report shows a carry-over of \$205,000,000 for the Army of the Philippines.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There is no other way that funds may be constantly available for the maintenance of the Army of the Philippines, and until the islands are free again the funds carried will not be used. To fail to carry

the item would no doubt be a serious blow to the morale of the Filipino people.

Mr. BUCK. That is a goodly sum. If it is not needed it might be stricken out.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I invite the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to the last item in the report, an item in which I am very much interested, because I happen to know the history connected with it. It is as follows:

The committee recommend that the following proviso be stricken from the bill: "Provided, That appropriations in this act which are available for any expenses incident to educating persons in medicine (including veterinary) or dentistry shall be available only when such persons can complete instruction in degree-granting colleges or universities as students in such professions within 2 years, provided also that such students must be enlisted in the Army of the United States."

I may say, Mr. President, in furtherance of my view on that subject, that I know as a matter of fact that many young men, and I take it young women also, in colleges and universities throughout the country, some of whom, for instance, have just completed their junior year in a particular course, were induced to go into these professions, and to take up this work, looking forward to becoming students in medicine and dentistry in the Army. To cut these young men and young women off, and say that they cannot have sustenance from the appropriations unless they are in the last 2 years of their courses, would be to render a great injustice to thousands of young persons in this country who are willing to study, and some of whom are now in the Army studying under this program. Some of them have been in the Army for a year, some for 6 months. To carry out the program which is now suggested by the heads of our Military Establishment, and cut these young people off, and say that they cannot have any support from the Government unless they can complete their courses within 2 years, would be to default in our promise made to these young people when they gave up their college courses.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the committee shared the viewpoint expressed by the Senator from Nevada and recommended that this limitation be stricken from the bill, and on Saturday last the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees upon the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, before the Chair makes announcement with respect to the conferees I wish to say that the ratio with respect to majority and minority conferees on the part of the Senate is 1½ to 1 or 3 to 2. My attention was called earlier in the day to the conferees appointed on the Post Office and Justice Department bill as being in ratio of 5 to 2. I shall discuss that matter a little later, and have the situation corrected. At this time I wish to know if we are to have the same ratio of conferees as appointed on the other conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon realizes that it is the custom for the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator in charge of the bill, to furnish the Chair with a list of conferees.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that. The responsibility still remains with the occupant of the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed list which was furnished by the Senator from Oklahoma contains five majority members and two minority members.

Mr. McNARY. That is not according to the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What does the Senator from Oregon suggest?

Mr. McNARY. The ratio should be 5 to 3 at least or 3 to 2. If it were 5 to 3 I would not object.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, it is customary to place on conference committees representatives of legislative committees. As a rule members of legislative committees do not attend the sessions of the Appropriations Committee, but nevertheless that is the rule. I was going to ask that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the author of the only controversial amendment, be added to the list of conferees.

He is the author of the amendment to strike out the limitation with respect to defense plants and the Defense Supplies Corporation.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that would make the ratio 5 to 3, would it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, inadvertently, the Senator from Oklahoma said I was the author of the amendment to strike out the limitation with respect to the defense plants and the Defense Supplies Corporation. That amendment was not the one in which I was interested. I am sure the Senator simply mis-spoke himself. I was interested in the other amendment which seeks to place a limit on the number of years during which soldiers can be given schooling in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces the following list of conferees on the part of the Senate and trusts it will be satisfactory to the Senate. The names of the conferees will be read by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. GURNEY.

INCREASE OF DEFENSE HOUSING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1109, Calendar No. 332.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1109) to increase by \$400,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended; and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor, with an amendment, on page 3, after line 7, to strike out:

SEC. 4. That the provisions of section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 22) and sections 114 and 115 of the Criminal Code of the United States (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 204 and 205) or of any other law shall not be construed to prevent any Member of or Delegate to Congress, or Resident Commissioner, from leasing or renting any housing accommodations in the District of Columbia, in the city of Alexandria, in Arlington County or Fairfax County in the Commonwealth of Virginia, or in Montgomery County, Prince Georges County, or Charles County, in the State of Maryland, owned or operated by the United States or in which it has any interest and for the tenancy of which he and his family would otherwise be eligible.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc.,

SECTION 1. That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "\$1,200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,600,000,000."

SEC. 2. That section 3 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and a further proviso, as follows: "Provided further, That the term 'administrative expenses' as used herein shall be deemed to include administrative expenses of the National Housing Agency in connection with any functions performed by it with respect to priorities or allocations of materials relating to public or private housing for persons engaged in national defense activities."

SEC. 3. That section 303 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 303. Moneys derived from rental or operation of property acquired or constructed under the provisions of this act, of Public Laws Nos. 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, and of section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, shall be available for expenses of operation and maintenance and expenses found necessary in the disposition of any such property or the removal of temporary housing by the Administrator, including the establishment of necessary reserves therefor and administrative expenses in connection therewith: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, moneys, derived by the Administrator from the rental or operation of any such property may be deposited in an appropriation account or accounts in the Treasury: *And provided further*, That except for necessary reserves authorized by this act or by section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, the unobligated balances of the moneys deposited into the Treasury from the rental or

operation of such property shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may request unanimous consent that at this time the Senate take up a bill which came over from the House, House bill 2520, a bill extending the provisions of the so-called pipe line bill? The bill must be passed by the Senate before tomorrow night. I have endeavored to obtain recognition in order to move that the Senate consider the bill. The Interior Department is very anxious to have the bill passed. I have spoken to both the majority leader and the minority leader, and I think there is absolutely no objection to the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, what would the bill do?

Mr. WHEELER. It would extend for 2 years the provisions of the so-called pipeline bill which would authorize the President by proclamation to permit certain pipe lines to be built.

The committee held hearings on the bill, and the representative from the Petroleum Conservation Division stated it was necessary to have the bill passed if they were to be able to build any more pipe lines. We asked him if at the present time he contemplated that any more would be built. He said they did not have any in contemplation, except one which the Sinclair Oil Co. was thinking of building from Chicago or Toledo, I think, and that because of that fact they probably might need the legislation, in order to permit them to obtain rights-of-way across the lands in some States in which at the present time they cannot condemn the lands.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As the Senator doubtless knows, there are very large sections of the country—

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if there is to be discussion on the bill, I think I should not yield for that purpose; because we have been waiting for some time, and the consideration of the bills which I am to offer will not require very much time. After their consideration is completed there will be opportunity for discussion of other bills.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the very distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] advised me that he was favorable to the bill but would desire to be present. He now is in a meeting of a conference committee which is considering a bill which passed the Senate yesterday. If the Senator from Utah will describe his bill there will be an opportunity for the Senator from Ohio to return to the Chamber.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I sent a note to the Senator from Ohio, as he requested me to do, and I think he will be here immediately. The Senator from Ohio is a member of the subcommittee which handled the bill. The chairman of the subcommittee is the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who is ill, and not able to present the bill at this time.

The bill would merely increase the amount of money which has already been

allowed to the Defense Homes Corporation for the building of defense houses. In 1943 and 1944 approximately 1,100,000 persons will have to be housed. The bill provides for the housing of those persons.

The bill would not change the primary law, except it would provide that the rentals and the fees which would be received would be returned to the Treasury; but in the meantime they could be used to aid in changing the houses, which primarily are defense houses, and, therefore, are not suitable for use as more permanent structures in case the opportunity for permanent use develops. The President of the United States sent to Congress a message which is included in the report. In the message he suggested the proposed extension. The need is with us, as everyone knows. The housing facilities of the country have been united under one head, with the exception of the facilities which are handled under the Lanham Act. The bill is not in any sense related to that act, but has to do only with defense housing, a matter which is entirely a part of the war effort.

Mr. President, I think there is such complete understanding on the part of all Members of the Senate that any further explanation is unnecessary.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not desire to interrupt the Senator in his remarks.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall be glad to be interrupted.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator. Let me ask what is the total amount which has been expended or loaned for this purpose?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The first bill provided for \$1,200,000,000. The \$400,000,000 which would be added by the second bill would allow the law to read "\$1,600,000,000 for defense housing purposes."

Mr. McNARY. The "second bill" referred to by the Senator is the bill the Senator is now discussing; is it?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. The pending bill would increase the amount to \$1,600,000,000. One billion two hundred million dollars has already been appropriated and has quite generally been allocated.

Mr. McNARY. Of that vast sum, what proportion does the Senator expect the Government will lose by reason of the venture?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In theory, the Government should not lose on these defense housing projects; but in fact, we know the Government will lose on them. I may say very frankly to the Senator—and this is my own opinion—that the fallacy which has been entertained all along with respect to defense housing projects of various kinds has been that the houses should be built in such a way as to be merely temporary structures.

The problem which is facing the defense housing organization is that presented by priorities, allocations, and materials. The organization is extending, and changing its plans to meet the situation so that it will not run into conflict

with the demands for strategic materials.

Of course, the loss resulting from the program will not be so great as that in the case of other military programs, because the houses will be used and will bring in certain returns all the time. Of course, the demand is very great.

Mr. McNARY. I assume that many of these projects have simply a salvage value, as distinguished from a continuous or permanent value.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I will go further than that and say that many of them have not even a salvage value, because their construction is such that the salvage will not amount to very much. But wherever sewer systems have been put in for a project, or wherever streets have been built for a project, a primary improvement of that kind will be of value to the community and to the country.

Mr. McNARY. Is it the opinion of the able Senator that this will probably be the last claim of the War Department for funds for this purpose during the present year?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think it will be for the present year. If the war continues, there is no doubt in my mind that in 1945 it will become necessary to ask for more housing.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I heard the question of the Senator from Oregon. My own view is that in all probability there will be no more housing, simply because in 1944, so far as I know, there will be no further extension of manufacture. If there should be a further extension of manufacture, undoubtedly more housing would be required; but as I understand, the War Department program has practically come to an end as far as the expansion of manufacturing facilities is concerned. This is calculated on the present program of expansion. In the absence of any further expansion, I should expect this to be the last bill authorizing further housing. Furthermore, I somewhat doubt whether the \$400,000,000 will all be needed this year. I think we can leave to the Appropriations Committee the question of whether \$200,000,000 or \$300,000,000 may be enough. I thought we should be fairly liberal in authorization, so that we might avoid any possible future necessity for a further authorization bill. I hope we can say pretty definitely that this is the last bill on war housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Utah if this bill has any relationship to the construction of general community facilities, such as schools, in the war-industry areas?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think not. This is purely a defense housing bill. I believe the Senator is asking about the Lanham Act funds, which do provide facilities of various kinds.

Mr. VANDENBERG. This is unrelated to that class of projects?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am informed that the bill to which the Senator from Michigan refers has not as yet been reported.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds a bill which has passed the House, and which would provide an additional \$200,000,000 for community facilities. The first hearings were held on the bill this morning. They will continue tomorrow. Of course, there is a very close relationship between the two measures, not legislatively, but because of the need for community facilities if the housing program is to be carried through.

Mr. TAFT. None of the money in this bill could be used for community facilities, or for anything except housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill S. 1109 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARE OF CHILDREN OF MOTHERS EMPLOYED IN WAR AREAS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1130, Calendar No. 372.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1130) to provide for care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator spoke to me about this bill, as did the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and also Mr. Charles Taft. Was this bill, in some other form, before the Senate earlier in the session?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. This bill is not a substitute in a legislative sense, but is a substitute for the bill introduced by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The bill was submitted to the various departments interested, and this is the result of the study, after the Senate refused to make an appropriation in connection with an appropriation bill.

Mr. McNARY. I was attempting to revive my memory. I thought the Senator from Arizona had introduced a bill covering the same objective.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. McNARY. That was rejected by the Senate, was it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; the bill was not rejected. The rejection came about in this way: There was an item in one of the appropriation bills for which there had not been legislation. The Senator from Arizona therefore introduced a bill which would provide the legislation. The recommendation came from the President, through the Budget. Because of the legislative situation, the Senator from Arizona introduced his bill. The

bill was sent to the Committee on Education and Labor and this is a substitute for it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the only time this question was before the Senate was when it was attempted to attach a rider providing for this appropriation to an appropriation bill, and I think on the objection of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] that item was rejected as being legislation on an appropriation bill. Our committee was practically instructed to prepare a proper authorization bill. That has now been done. In the interval the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] also introduced a bill, but it was never considered by the Senate. This is a substitute for it.

Mr. McNARY. I am very happy to have the explanation. That is what I had in mind. It met defeat in the Senate in some form or other. I recall that I raised the point of order that it was legislation on an appropriation bill. As I understand, this is the authorization bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to study the bill or the report. It seems to me to be a most comprehensive plan, and a new plan for Federal assistance in social matters. I notice on page 3, as I hurriedly read the bill, that it provides as follows:

(b) A State plan for extended school services shall be submitted by the State educational agency. Such State plan may provide for nursery school, before-school and after-school care, health services for children and other auxiliary services necessary to assure proper use of extended school services and to safeguard children receiving care under the plan. Such services and care shall be administered by or through public-school systems designated in the plan for such purpose and may be rendered or conducted by public or nonprofit private-school systems.

It seems to me that this bill contemplates an extraordinarily large program, and one which should be given a great deal of consideration and careful thought before we engage in it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the bill has been given a great deal of consideration, and I am sure a great deal of care. Extensive hearings were held, and witnesses appeared.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Are the hearings printed?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; the hearings are printed and are available.

The statement of the Senator from Colorado as to the comprehensive nature of the bill is correct. It provides for cooperation between Federal Government agencies which have been in existence for a long time and State agencies which have been in existence for a long time. I think it is hardly correct to say that the bill is entirely new in its nature. It calls for cooperation on the part of the Child Welfare Division, which has been in the Department of Labor for a generation.

The theory of the bill is that the various agencies which are already in existence—State educational systems and private educational systems—can furnish the necessary requirements for

nurseries for certain kinds of child care. The need grows out of the war effort. The bill is a war bill. It would come to an end 6 months after the end of the war. It is the pressing need of the emergency which has brought it into existence. The genius of the bill comes from the fact that all the agencies, both in the States and in the Federal Government, which can turn to this activity have turned to it.

Perhaps better than in any other bill we have had in connection with the war effort, the theory of the pending bill represents complete cooperation between the State institutions, both public and private, and the Federal institutions, for the care of children. The need is exceedingly great. While other institutions and agencies of government have established nurseries and have done good work, there is no conflict between them. There would be an expansion of that which has been done, and a general bringing together of the agencies which are already in existence. Because of a lack of funds, some have neglected to take advantage of their opportunities in contributing to the welfare of the children of mothers who are in industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I notice that the bill was placed upon the calendar only yesterday, June 28. At a late hour, after the Senate has passed upon appropriation bills, and other important legislation, the Senator now brings forward a bill of this character. Usually a bill which would be brought up under such conditions would be a noncontroversial bill, which would ordinarily pass by unanimous consent. However, Mr. President, I do not look upon this bill as being in that category. The bill may be a splendid one, and it may be necessary. It may be that some emergency requires its early passage. I doubt if any State now has any plan whereby it could qualify itself to operate under this bill. Perhaps many States would need to enact legislation before they could meet the requirements of the bill. I feel that the bill is one which should not be enacted at the present time. I think the Senate should be put on some notice that a bill of such importance is to come before the Senate so that hearings may be reviewed by Senators who are interested in the subject. Senators should have the opportunity of inquiring into the nature of the bill, what it proposes to do, how it proposes to operate, and what its effect will be upon the country and the different States. I hope the Senator will not press for the passage of the bill today. I may be in favor of it after I have studied it, but today I should be very much opposed to having it passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, all that the Senator has said is true excepting for the fact that the Senator from Utah assumed there would be no opposition to the bill because of the way in which it was handled, the way in which it was presented to the Senate in the first place. The Hayden amendment was offered. The measure was re-

ferred to the committee. Long hearings were held upon it. The bill is of an emergency nature. If there be opposition to the bill, it comes about by reason of misunderstanding. There are those who have felt that it would be better to continue the Lanham Act theory. I have no objection to continuing the Lanham Act theory of direct grants to the States without going through the medium of State cooperation. However, there is in reality no conflict between the way the bill would function and the way the Lanham Act functions in the conduct of nurseries and the care of children. The bill would make it possible to expand and use the agencies in the States in such a way that children would actually be benefited. We would not be required to deal with that terrible problem which always arises after a war, namely, the neglect of children which brings great injury, of course, to any community of any nation as the result of a war.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I join the Senator from Colorado in the request that the bill go over. This subject was considered before the Appropriations Committee. I am not unmindful at this time of the way in which the committee voted to report the bill. As I recall, there was opposition to it in the committee. I should like to check on that, however, before making the statement positive. By what I believe was a majority of the full committee the chairman was authorized to offer an amendment on the floor which was considered to be legislation. As the Senator will recall, it was deferred at that time. However, in view of the nature of the proposed legislation and the many objections which lie against legislation of this nature, I join with the Senator from Colorado in requesting that the bill go over for a reasonable time in order that we may have an opportunity of studying it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, after consultation with the leaders, I assumed that the bill would not be controversial in its nature. I can do nothing, of course, but accede to the request of the Senator from Colorado, and the Senator from Nevada, and allow the bill to go over for future consideration. However, I trust that the Senate will act upon it soon. The need is great. If we do not make the necessary appropriations for these people many months will pass, and in the meantime a great injury will be done to the mothers who are offering their services to the country; as well as to the children.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before the bill goes over I should like to make a remark with respect to it. I have supported the measure because I believe it meets the requirements which a bill of this nature should be designed to meet. In the first place, it expires with the war, at the termination of the war. When the bill comes up I should like to offer an amendment which would make the measure expire with the termination of hostilities instead of termination of the war. However, that is a comparatively unimportant matter.

In the first place, the bill would operate entirely through the States and would not set up a Federal agency throughout the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is a question in which some of us are very much interested, and as to which we should like to be entirely certain.

Mr. TAFT. I will state frankly what the difficulty is. The W. P. A., without any legislative authority, set up or supported nursery schools in many sections of the United States. In my opinion it did so without any legislative authority whatsoever. It is spending a considerable amount of money in operating those schools. The W. P. A. will terminate on the 1st of July. It is therefore important that there be some legislation provided by the 1st of July to determine whether these nursery schools shall be continued. The present bill provides for their operation through the States. There are many persons who wish to maintain direct Federal assistance throughout the United States and, incidentally, the personnel of the former W. P. A. desires to maintain it in order that that personnel may have something to do throughout the United States instead of being dissolved as they are supposedly being dissolved by provisions of appropriation acts, and other legislative enactments of Congress. That question arises. I believe the work should be performed through the States instead of through any direct Federal plan. The same question will arise in the case of the community facilities bill under the Lanham Act. The W. P. A. is again endeavoring to assume the obligation of distributing the money required for the maintenance of schools throughout the United States by direct Federal action.

It seems to me that the work should be performed under the Lanham Act, through State boards of education. We have had before us many State directors of education urging that it be done through the States. That issue arises certainly in connection with the bill referred to, although I think both the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Education and Labor have approved the bill in its present form.

I think that if women are to work in defense industries, if they are to be called upon to work, we must make some provision for taking care of the children, particularly the younger ones, when the women are working in the factories. Otherwise the mothers will not work, and we will not have the womanpower necessary to fill the vacancies in the war-production plants.

There are today in nearly every city in the country exceedingly difficult problems involving juvenile delinquency, which is increasing by leaps and bounds, and for which some provision should be made. The bill operates as to the younger children through the Children's Bureau, it operates so far as the older children are concerned through the schools and through the United States Office of Education. The United States Office of

Education works through the State boards of education, and the Children's Bureau works through the State welfare agencies. It seems to me the matter can be worked out soundly, and the best solution we have can be presented.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should simply like to make an appeal to Senators who have asked that the proposed legislation go over, that they give it their immediate consideration. I assure them that, in my humble opinion, it would be nothing short of tragic if Congress should adjourn or take a recess without enacting legislation on this subject. Congress will have to accept responsibility if such an unfortunate event should occur, with the continued rise in the alarming condition of delinquency among the youth of this Nation. Conditions have reached such a point, in my opinion, that it is absolutely necessary that some sound action be taken on this question.

So far as I know, the bill has received a unanimous report from the Committee on Education and Labor, after careful consideration of the whole problem involved. Naturally a bill cannot be reported which will be satisfactory to everyone, and the fact that the Senator from Ohio suggested that there is a going concern operating in this field at the present time means that it has friends who would like to see it continued. But I believe we should take action on the subject at the earliest possible moment, and I hope Senators who have asked that the bill go over will give it their immediate consideration.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I shall try to bring the bill before the Senate as soon as I can, and I urge Senators who have not wanted to consider it at the present time to give it earnest study.

I merely desire to add that the Committee on Education and Labor has asked time and time again of all the agencies of Government interested in the bill that they consult and work together, and we brought about unity of action, so far as the regular agency of the Government was concerned. When we came to the end of the P. W. A., this bill became necessary.

As a war effort, there is probably no more pressing legislation. We all know that without the help of the mothers in the industries, we probably would not have had the manpower essential for the needs of the Nation, and the children of mothers should not be neglected. They may be sorely neglected after July 1 if legislation such as that proposed by the bill we are discussing does not come into being.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from Utah withdrawn his motion for consideration?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Utah withdraws his motion for immediate consideration of the bill.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEEEE ON DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, earlier in the day I very faintly complained about the ratio of conferees on war establishment appropriation conferences, and that was corrected. I stated then the ratio as 3 to 2, or 1½ to 1, agreed upon by the conference between the Senate majority and minority.

My attention has been called to the appointment of the conferees on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency. I observe that there are five Democrats appointed on the conference and two Republicans. Of course, that is far from the proper ratio. I am not attempting to be political; I give political considerations very little thought when it comes to the matter of conferences, but to maintain the ratio, in all fairness another Republican should be appointed on this conference, which still would not bring the number up to the mathematical ratio agreed upon, but would make it 5 to 3.

I ask for a modification of the order, and that the Republican Senator on the subcommittee next in line, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], be appointed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is appointed a conferee on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, and 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and medical examinations where necessary to determine eligibility for vocational rehabilitation, the nature of rehabilitation services required, or occupational limitations, in the case"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the follow-

ing: "establishing such facilities and furnishing such"; and the Senate agree to the same.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
EDWARD J. HART,
JOHN LESINSKI,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

INTERSTATE PETROLEUM PIPE LINES

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2520, which is on the calendar. This is the bill which I stated a few moments ago is for the purpose of extending the act known as the Pipe Line Act. The act will expire tomorrow night, and it is important that if it is to be passed at all, it be passed at this time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the Senator from Montana explain the bill. There are some of us in the Senate, and there is a large section of the population of the country, who have regarded the activities of the Petroleum Coordinator for War with very great misgiving. We realize that he has been so surrounded by the big oil companies that he has his staff made up almost exclusively of representatives of such companies as the Standard of California, and other big oil companies, and I do not want to extend any more authority than is necessary to the Petroleum Coordinator for War.

Furthermore, I am growing tired of the practice of the Interior Department and the crowd there always rushing in on the very last day, at the 59th minute of the 11th hour, and saying, "You have to pass this bill extending this act because the law will expire in 15 or 20 minutes."

It seems to me these matters should be taken up at the proper time, and not brought in as emergency measures.

As I have said, I should like to have the Senator from Montana explain the bill. I do not wish to impede any war effort; I am merely expressing the fears and doubts a great many people have about the petroleum administration.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Montana tell us the number of the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2520) to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, this bill was introduced in the House on May 24 last, and lengthy hearings were held before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and it was discussed very thoroughly in the committee. The bill was amended as had been proposed by Secretary Ickes, by inserting certain

provisions which restricted some of the things the Interior Department originally wanted.

I shall not read the definitions in the act which the bill would extend, but in section 2 it is provided:

Sec. 2. Whenever the President finds that the construction of any pipe line for the transportation and/or distribution of petroleum or petroleum products moving in interstate commerce, or the extension or completion of any such pipe line already wholly or partly constructed, it or may be necessary for national-defense purposes, he shall by proclamation declare such finding.

Sec. 3. In case the construction, extension, or completion of any such pipe line is undertaken otherwise than as provided in section 4, the person or persons undertaking such construction, extension, or completion may acquire such land or interests in land, including rights-of-way or easements, by the exercise of the right of eminent domain, as, in the opinion of the President, may be necessary for such purposes, and for purposes of operation and maintenance of such pipe line.

I will state the original purpose of the act. It was proposed to construct a pipe line through Georgia. There is a provision of the Georgia State statute prohibiting condemnation of land for pipeline purposes. The railroads at that time objected to having their lines of railroad crossed by pipe lines. One reason for passage of the act was the existence of this State law. Another reason was that condemnation laws differ so widely in the various States that during the war matters could be tied up indefinitely if legislation of this character were not enacted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill at this time, but I repeat that a great many persons have had a feeling of distrust because of the attitude of Petroleum Coordinator Ickes toward some of the big oil companies. It is a disgrace. To begin with, there is a man named Davies who really runs the agency. He receives \$51,000 from the Standard Oil Co. and \$9,000 from the Government. If the amount of payment were reversed, and he were to receive \$51,000 from the Government and \$9,000 from the oil company, we would obtain better service from him tomorrow. I do not think there is any question that Mr. Ickes' whole attitude toward the big oil companies building these pipe lines in the Texas field largely controlled by the big oil companies is calculated after the war to give the big oil companies the pipe lines for nothing. When they obtain restoration of tanker service from Gulf ports to the Atlantic ports, the big oil companies will have the independent oil companies, particularly in the mid-continent field, under their control.

I think this extension of right of condemnation is probably necessary. I did wish, however, to repeat my observations about the way in which this whole office has been prostituted to the service of the big oil companies.

Mr. WHEELER. I should be opposed to such legislation if it were not necessary to transport oil to the eastern sea-

board, and the only way that can be done in any reasonable time is in the manner suggested.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator from Montana that a delegation of Senators, including some Members of the Senate who know more about the oil business in a minute than Secretary Ickes would know in a year, such as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], completely demonstrated to Mr. Ickes by facts and figures from official sources that it would be very much more beneficial to the service of supply for the eastern seaboard to build the eastern leg of the proposed pipeline first, and leave the southwestern leg to be served by railroads, than it would otherwise, and Mr. Ickes, after apparently being convinced by these arguments, which were unanswerable, permitted Mr. Davies and Major Parten and that crowd from the big oil companies, to influence him to decide otherwise.

Mr. WHEELER. That matter was gone into and discussed very thoroughly in the committee, because the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] were both present when the matter came up for discussion. The same criticism which the Senator from Missouri has directed against this proposal was directed in the committee. However, those lines have now been completed, at least one of them has been, and the other will be completed, as I understand, by the end of the year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But we do not know what the big oil companies will try to grab off next.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Reserving the right to object, I want to make a brief comment about this measure. We all have our weaknesses, we all have our predilections. I think Mr. Ickes in that respect, therefore, is quite human. But if I ever saw a man who is zealous for a cause it is the Secretary of the Interior for any cause which he may chance to embrace.

Consequently when Secretary Ickes was designated as the Petroleum Administrator for War, and when he was given charge of the construction of pipe lines under certain conditions, Mr. Ickes, with his usual zeal and enthusiasm, immediately took as his prime mission in life to construct a pipe line everywhere anybody would let him build one. So upon every occasion, to the exclusion of any other method of transportation for petroleum, Mr. Ickes advocated a pipe line.

Mr. President, I want to be sure that there is no Messianic mission in this bill.

Mr. WHEELER. I did not catch that remark, Mr. President.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to be sure that Mr. Ickes is not made the Messiah of pipe lines in this bill, so that he will not consider that the authority which has been conferred upon him has amounted to the declaration of the Congress that the prime mission which he is to employ in life is to build pipe lines everywhere he

can possibly find pipe lines not in existence.

I am one of those who believe that Mr. Ickes has done a disservice to the transportation of petroleum by his overzeal for pipe lines. I know that he has not only assumed the authority which the act confers upon him to build pipe lines but he has tried to keep any other method of transporting petroleum from being provided—at least, if it happened to be waterway development. I am confident, Mr. President, that if the able Senator from Montana were to amend the bill so as to give the Secretary of the Interior jurisdiction over inland waterways, and that provision were to become law, tomorrow Mr. Ickes would propose to double all the inland waterways in the United States. We can be sure of that. He is for anything he has control of. Let there be no mistake about that.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I regard this as permissive authority which is conferred upon Secretary Ickes. I suppose we got along some way or another when we did not have pipe lines, or Secretary Ickes, and probably we can get along without building a pipe line everywhere in the United States, even with Secretary Ickes.

I think Secretary Ickes has been intellectually dishonest in withholding from the Congress information about the facilities which were available for the movement of petroleum to the Atlantic seaboard of the United States. A little while ago when there was a waterway proposal before Congress he sent his representative before the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, and that representative made a statement to the committee which influenced its action, that we would have sufficient quantities of petroleum on the Atlantic seaboard by the facilities that Mr. Ickes was providing.

After the committee had acted upon that advice, to which it had a right to give credence, Mr. Ickes repudiated the statement and said that of course we would not have sufficient facilities to bring an adequate quantity of petroleum to the Atlantic seaboard.

Then when the same proposal was pending before the Senate Appropriations subcommittee, the chairman of which was the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], Secretary Ickes' representatives refused to disclose to that subcommittee full data as to what demands there would be on the Atlantic seaboard for the petroleum supplies there. Not only that, but Mr. Ickes' representative injected himself into the controversy not only to advocate pipe lines but to oppose alternative methods of transportation which were suggested, in the face of the express limitation in the Executive order making him Petroleum Administrator for War, which denied him authority over the subject of the transportation of petroleum, that function having been given to the Office of Defense Transportation. However, of course, Mr. Ickes absorbs and assumes every authority which it is permissible

by any stretch of power and authority for him to assume. Inasmuch as Mr. Eastman is a mild-mannered man, whereas Mr. Ickes is a man who, in expressing himself, always demonstrates the possession of a great many vitamins, of course Mr. Ickes always noses out the rather mild-mannered and timid Mr. Eastman, and, in the face of express Presidential negative, assumes authority over the transportation of petroleum.

The result is that the Atlantic seaboard continues to be short of petroleum, and Mr. Ickes' estimates continue to fall short of the facts.

I think it should be understood that if the bill is to be renewed, Mr. Ickes will merely be given a permissive authority, and will not be designated by the Congress as the white knight whose purpose will be to build a pipe line anywhere in the United States that the dictates of his cupidity, fancy, or folly may lead him to desire to construct one.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from Florida has seen fit to criticize a member of the President's Cabinet; because when the Senator from Florida criticizes a member of the Cabinet there must be something quite bad about him. However, I desire to say about Mr. Ickes that he is a very able executive, and his honesty cannot be questioned by anyone.

Let me say to the Senator from Florida that before Mr. Ickes could act, he would be required to obtain a proclamation from the President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2520) to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT BILLS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, first, I desire to obtain unanimous consent that, during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session, I may report from the Committee on Appropriations the bill on appropriations for the war agencies, so that the Senate will be able to consider it tomorrow. During the recess of the Senate between now and tomorrow, I desire to report the war agencies appropriations bill, which, in my judgment, will be ready in time to be reported before the Senate meets tomorrow.

The Appropriations Committee also has before it a deficiency appropriation bill which may be ready in time to be reported before tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in the face of the necessity which confronts us, I have no other course to pursue except to do the unusual, and say, "All right."

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. The two bills must pass the Senate by tomorrow night; is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. When will the Senator report the bill? Will he report it today?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; not until tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. So that it will be possible to take up the bill at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning; is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. And the deficiency bill will follow?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Will that end all the appropriation bills?

Mr. McKELLAR. That will end all the appropriation bills, we hope. There are one or two which have not finally been agreed upon, but we hope to get all of them through.

Mr. McNARY. How many conference reports remain to be agreed to?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a conference report which is ready to be presented as soon as the pending matter is disposed of. As soon as we shall have disposed of the pending matter, I shall present the conference report, if I may do so.

Mr. McNARY. How many conference reports remain to be agreed to, in addition to the one the Senator refers to?

Mr. McKELLAR. There will be one on appropriations for the war agencies, and another one on the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency.

Mr. McNARY. Is it the judgment of the very capable Senator that it will be possible for the Senate to dispose of the appropriation bills and all the conference reports by tomorrow night?

Mr. McKELLAR. We hope to do so. Barring accidents, we may be able to do so. Of course, in the last several days, I have been defeated on two conference reports. I am about to make the attempt again, in a few minutes, in presenting another conference report. I will stick out my neck and, if necessary, will take a third licking by the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Let me conclude by inquiring whether the hearings on the war agencies appropriations bill have been printed.

Mr. McKELLAR. No. They will be ready by tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me see if the unanimous-consent request covers sufficient ground. I understand that the Senator from Tennessee has requested that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to submit reports on any bills it has ready to report during the recess of the Senate, between the hour of recess today and the hour of meeting tomorrow. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Tennessee is agreed to.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States, having met, after full and free conference,

have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 8.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 4, 5, 6, and 7, and from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That there is hereby established in the Army of the United States, for the period of the present war and for six months thereafter or for such shorter period as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation shall prescribe, a component to be known as the 'Women's Army Corps'. The total number of women enlisted or appointed in the Women's Army Corps shall not exceed the number authorized from time to time by the President."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"The enlisted personnel of such corps shall consist of women of excellent character in good physical health, who are enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the last paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (54 Stat. 213), and who are on the date of such enlistment citizens of the United States between the ages of twenty and fifty years."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"The commanding officer of such corps shall be a colonel and such officers of lower rank shall be appointed as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That physicians and nurses shall not be enlisted in this corps: *And provided further*, That commissioned officers and noncommissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps shall exercise command only over women of the Women's Army Corps and other members of the Army of the United States specifically placed under their command."

And the House agree to the same.

ROBT. R. REYNOLDS,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
MATTHEW J. MERRITT,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alben	Blibo	Butler
Andrews	Bone	Byrd
Ball	Bridges	Capper
Bankhead	Brooks	Caraway
Barkley	Buck	Chandler

Chavez	Lucas	Robertson
Clark, Mo.	McCarran	Russell
Danaher	McClellan	Scruggam
Davis	McFarland	Shipstead
Downey	McKellar	Smith
Eastland	McNary	Stewart
Ferguson	Maloney	Taft
George	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Gerry	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Green	Millikin	Truman
Guffey	Moore	Tunnell
Gurney	Murdock	Tydings
Hatch	Murray	Vandenberg
Hawkes	Nye	Van Nuys
Hayden	O'Daniel	Wagner
Hill	O'Mahoney	Wallgren
Holman	Overton	Wheeler
Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Wherry
Kilgore	Radcliffe	White
La Follette	Reed	Willis
Langer	Revercomb	Wilson
Lodge	Reynolds	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The report was agreed to.

RELATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS BY UNITED NATIONS TOWARD WINNING THE WAR—GALLUP POLL AMONG THE BRITISH PEOPLE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, at this time I respectfully address the people of the British Empire, and I especially wish to have the ear of our distinguished friend and fellow world-wide patriot, Mr. Winston Churchill.

This afternoon we appropriated \$71,000,000,000 for our part in participating in the present World War. I am informed by one of my colleagues that last year we appropriated about \$75,000,000,000. I dare say that during our participation in the present World War we have appropriated and authorized the expenditure of more money than all the appropriations and expenditures of both the other Allied Powers and the Axis Powers.

In other words, during our participation in the present World War we have doubtless spent more than all the Axis nations and all the other Allied nations combined. I make mention of that fact, and call it to the particular attention of Mr. Churchill and the British people because I have just read in the columns of a magazine having Nation-wide circulation a statement to the effect that a Gallup poll was recently taken in the British Isles, at which time the British people were asked to cast their votes on the relative contribution of the United Nations toward winning the war.

The British people, whom we are aiding, with whom we are cooperating, and whom we are trying to save, being afforded that opportunity, voted as follows:

They voted that Russia had contributed 50 percent to winning of the war; that Great Britain had contributed 43 percent; that China had contributed 5 percent; and we were given honorable mention by their vote to the effect that we had contributed 3 percent to the winning of the war.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the clerk of the Appropriations Committee will be here in a moment with the conference report. While we are waiting for it, I wish to state to the Senate what is in it.

The Senate voted on this question earlier in the day. To use a slang expression, perhaps I ought not to have "stuck my neck out" again by even asking that the bill again go to conference; but some Members were very much interested in another phase of the conference on this bill, which has been taking place almost daily for weeks, so the conferees were called together. They have made a report, reporting the much controverted matter which was voted on earlier in the day exactly as it then stood.

In addition, the House conferees have agreed to the Senate amendment, as amended by the House, placing certain restrictions on the President's use of his personal fund, with certain exceptions. Those exceptions are, first, that he may use it in any way he sees fit for the War Department; secondly, that he may use it for the Navy Department in any way he sees fit; thirdly, that he may use it in any way he sees fit for the State Department, the F. B. I., and the strategic services. There is one other exception which escapes me at the moment, but which I shall state to the Senate as soon as the report arrives.

It is hoped, after conference with various members of the conference committee, that at this time the conference report may have enough votes to be adopted, so that worthy Government employees may receive their increases in salary, and the bill may become law.

As I have frequently stated, I do not agree with the method which the House has adopted for getting rid of the three Government employees in question. I feel very much better about it when I know that before next November they will come before the Senate and receive a fair deal. Ordinarily I would not take the course which the House has taken; but as I have told the Senate half a dozen times or more, this is the only way we can get a bill.

I happen to be the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

I do not think we ought to hold up a worthy bill such as this which affects so many of the employees of the Government, and which would increase their salaries to a certain extent.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McGill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87 to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concurred therein; that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 88, 92, 98, and 99 to the bill; agreed to

the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TARVER, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. WENE, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House still further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; that the House still further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 60 and 61 to the bill; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STARNES of Alabama, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. POWERS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CASE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this Act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other Act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Junior, and Robert Mors

Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 61.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
JOHN TAHER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have said about all I wanted to say about the subject. Senators know what is involved. I think it would be wise to vote, and if the conference report is rejected, the bill will have to fail.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand the Senator from Tennessee, the conferees have made no change whatever in the previous conference report regarding the three men who are to be discharged by the provision of the House bill. Am I correct in that regard?

Mr. McKELLAR. They made no change in the bill as reported to the Senate this morning.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. McKELLAR. But they have made very great changes every time we reported it. We have reported it so often that I am getting very tired of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. There has been no change in that provision in the conference report voted upon this morning.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, there has been no change in that provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. The change which has been made by the conferees is a change affecting the clipping of the President's wings regarding the use of funds appropriated for him by the Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, though I will not say that it is a clipping of the President's wings. If the Senator from Ken-

tucky claims it is, I remind him he voted this morning to clip the President's wings.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes, he did; because that was a part of the conference report which was defeated because that part of it was not in.

Mr. BARKLEY. What part?

Mr. McKELLAR. That part regarding the President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator refer to the expenditure of the fund?

Mr. McKELLAR. I refer to the expenditure of that fund. If that part had not been in the bill, as stated by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the report would probably have been agreed to. But the Senator from Kentucky voted with the fund perfectly free in the President. The Senator from Kentucky voted against agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know how I voted and I know how the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] voted. He voted against the conference report because it did not sufficiently clip the wings of the President. We might as well all be frank about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, let us be frank.

Mr. BARKLEY. I voted against the conference report notwithstanding the freedom of the President's fund, but because of the manner in which the employees were dealt with. The Senator from West Virginia voted against it because of the manner in which the fund was dealt with, he wants the President's wings clipped and the conferees have gone out and clipped them, and it is hoped that, now that the President's wings have been clipped, there will be mustered enough votes to adopt the conference report with no change whatever in the manner of dealing with these three men. That is the whole situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, if it is, let us vote on it.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is all right.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us try it again.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want every Senator to understand it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I tried to make it plain to the Senator this morning, but I was utterly unable to do so. I asked him both privately and publicly about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the issue now is that, in order to hold out some hope of getting the conference report agreed to, in spite of the fact that no change has been made in the manner of dealing with the three employees, the manner in which the President is to exercise his power in dealing with the funds appropriated by Congress is so modified as to induce a sufficient number of opponents on that ground to vote for its adoption. That is the whole truth about it. We might as well understand that that is the situation. And it has been frankly stated that the votes will be delivered, and they are now in the process of being delivered to adopt the conference report because the President's wings have been clipped some more.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator has correctly stated the situation. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I am satisfied the Senator hopes that, and I am satisfied the conferees have acted as they have in the hope that it is a sop to Senators who may cast the necessary votes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to make the point that there is no business before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator from Missouri will not take the position that when the Senator from Tennessee and I are before the Senate there is no business before it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I make the point of order that there is nothing before the Senate, and we are now being confronted by a filibuster by the Senator from Tennessee in an effort to tie up the work of the Senate until he can get his conference report agreed to. I make the point of order that there is no business before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky that this morning was the time to have brought that matter up, when I told him about it. I thought that as acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, as a part of the organization, when a report was brought before the Senate I had reason to expect, it might have been a very humble reason, it might have been a very good reason, but as a member of the organization I thought I had a right to expect that when the conference committee brought in a report we would receive help from the organization of our side of the Senate. We did not receive that help, but instead we received very active opposition. Due to the activity of our leadership, the conference report was defeated this morning. I am now offering another report, and I hope the Senate will undertake to vote on it, and vote on it tonight. I plead with my friend, the Senator from Missouri, not to make his point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not think we ought to vote on the conference report tonight. We have voted on it once today already. The Senate has acted on the conference report three times, and was three times flouted by its own conferees, an overwhelming majority of the Senate flouted three times by its own conferees. The House conferees never took the matter back for a separate vote. Always our conferees have yielded. Therefore, Mr. President, there is no necessity of bringing in the conference report at this hour of the night, and it should be laid over until tomorrow. I repeat my point of order that there is nothing before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer the conference report and move that it be agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. My report and motion have been made, have they not? I move the adoption of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report has been presented.

Mr. McKELLAR. And I made the motion that the report be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not yet in order. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Pepper
Andrews	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Barkley	Holman	Reynolds
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Bone	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scruggs
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Eyrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdoch	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gurney	Overton	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present.

The clerk will read the conference report for the information of the Senate. The report was read.

Mr. McKellar. I move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum having been suggested—

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought I had the floor, and I did not yield it to anyone to make a point of no quorum. I had sought recognition of the Chair at the time the Senator from Tennessee rose and made his motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to appeal to the Senator from Missouri not to make a parliamentary fight on the conference report. I do not see anything to be gained by throwing it over until tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not see any purpose in bringing in a conference report at this hour of the night, flouting three times the declared will of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. At this stage of the legislative situation it is necessary for the Senate and the House to hold late sessions and bring in matters of this kind at a late hour. Ordinarily, in a normal situation, it would not be done, but I do not think any exception can be taken to the fact that it is done in this particular instance. I do not see anything to be gained by forcing the matter to go over.

As the Senator knows, I am in sympathy with his views. I have rendered such feeble assistance as I could.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And rendered very valiant service in the cause.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that he should not complain at my attitude in reference to the matter because he got more votes for his conference report than the last time

it had been voted on, so my opposition seems to have helped him instead of hurting him.

Mr. McKellar. I thank all for the small favors they have given me heretofore, and I hope they will continue to give them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope sincerely the Senator from Missouri will not delay this matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is a very small attendance of the Senate present. If we are to vote on this matter, we should at least have as large an attendance as possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are more Senators on the floor now than there will be between 11 and 12 o'clock tomorrow, when the Senate will reconvene.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Therefore it seems to me that on a matter on which the Senate has decisively declared itself three different times, there should be a full attendance of the Senate before we are asked to repudiate that position.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am satisfied that on a roll call there will be a full attendance of the Senate, if there is a roll call.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There will be a roll call, if a sufficient number of seconds can be obtained, I assure the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If there is no reason to vote on the matter tonight, what reason is there for having a quorum call?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no point of order pending at the moment that a quorum is not present.

I sincerely hope the Senator from Missouri will permit this matter to come to a vote tonight, because I do not think the vote will be any different. There might be two or three one way or the other, depending on the presence or absence of Senators, but by and large the result would be the same this afternoon as it would be tomorrow morning. We have only one more day in which to dispose of the appropriation bills.

I share the feeling of the Senator from Missouri regarding the action of the conferees respecting this measure. We have had a vote on it three times. It has not been taken to the House for a vote. The House has not even been given an opportunity to recede from the language of its provision, which the Senate has three times voted down, and I think in fairness to the Senate and to the conferees themselves the House conferees should have been willing to take the bill back to the House to see whether the House itself, on another separate vote, would insist upon the language in the bill; but that has not been done. We have the conference report before us, and under the parliamentary situation it must be voted on in the Senate first, it cannot be voted on in the House first, and I hope we can dispose of it this afternoon, because tomorrow we will have two other appropriation bills which will be reported between now and 11 o'clock for consideration, and we will have two other conference reports. It is therefore impor-

tant that this matter be disposed of one way or the other, without going over until tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Did the Chair correctly understand the Senator from Tennessee to make a motion that the Senate now proceed to take up the conference report?

Mr. McKellar. Indeed I did.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

Mr. McKellar. I now move the adoption of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McKellar. Very well.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Pending that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Pepper
Andrews	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Barkley	Holman	Reynolds
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Bone	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Scruggs
Brooks	Langer	Shipstead
Buck	Lodge	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Eyrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Danaher	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Moore	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdoch	Wheeler
George	Murray	Wherry
Gerry	Nye	White
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gurney	Overton	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understand that earlier today the Senate voted on the question whether there should be Senate confirmation with respect to the three persons whose names are contained in the appropriations measure in dispute. Discussion was had as to whether they were this, that, or the other. I very frankly have never seen the testimony concerning these persons. I voted for the report which was made after free conference, with the understanding that if the charges made against these men were established to be true they would be presented in the Senate, and I would have another chance to vote. Now I understand, Mr. President, in addition to giving them this chance before the Senate of the United States, there is in this free conference report a limitation placed upon the expenditure of funds by the President of the United States. I should like to know whether my understanding is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have stated exactly what the limitation is. The limitation is a very broad one. We except entirely the State Department, the War Department, the Navy Department, the F. B. I., and the Office of Strategic Services, and I believe one other agency. I think there are seven in all.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. May we have read the proposed language, as it will appear in the conference report, if it shall be adopted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order that we may understand the complete language, why not have the whole amendment read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 5: Page 3, line 16, strike out "Provided, That no part of the funds continued available by this paragraph shall be allotted to or expended for the National Resources Planning Board or the Farm Security Administration or for any of the functions of either said Board or said Administration", and insert "Provided, That no part of the funds continued available by this paragraph shall be allotted to or expended for any of the functions of any agency of Government for which appropriations have been duly made by the Congress, or for the functions of any agency for which estimates have been submitted by the Budget and for which the Congress has failed to make appropriations: Provided further, That this limitation shall not apply to allotments or allocations made to the War Department or the Navy Department, the Department of State or the Office of Strategic Services or the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been away from the Senate Chamber in attendance on a committee meeting. I wish to know if the conference report now proposes to chop off the appropriation which would be made to pay the salaries of these three men, or if the appropriation is contingent for a period, and then upon reappointment the nominations of these men are to be confirmed by the Senate, because that is the point on which I shall base my vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. The language is exactly the same as that voted upon earlier today.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, that these men shall continue to be on the pay roll for a definite period of time?

Mr. McKELLAR. Until November 15.

Mr. WHERRY. The provision does not withhold the appropriation to pay their salary?

Mr. McKELLAR. It provides for payment until November 15, when they are to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it seems to me that the conference report under discussion this afternoon presents one of the most amazing spectacles that has ever been presented in the Senate of the United States or in any

other parliamentary body. The will of the Senate on this particular matter has been expressed overwhelmingly on three different occasions. The Senate struck out the House provision in the original bill by a vote of 69 to 0, whereupon the Senate conferees blithely entered into a conference, and after one session, one day, without the House Members making any concessions whatever, brought in a conference report accepting the House provision. That was defeated in this body after full debate by a vote of 52 to 17. It was a very unusual procedure for a conference report, particularly on a general appropriation bill, to be defeated by such an overwhelming vote in the Senate. It evidenced a very strong feeling on the part of the Senate upon this particular matter.

Thereupon the Senate conferees went into another very brief conference and emerged again with precisely the same proposition, or substantially the same proposition, putting in a little sop in the shape of allowing these fellows to stay on the pay roll until the 15th of November, whereupon if they were reappointed, they would have to have Senate confirmation.

The Senate considered the report, and after extensive debate it was again overwhelmingly defeated in this body. Whereupon in the course of 1 day the Senate conferees went back to conference and have returned with precisely the same proposition word for word.

So far as the provision with regard to these three men is concerned, it was voted down earlier today after extensive debate. But in the most bare-faced attempt to trade votes that I think I have ever witnessed in this body it was hoped to win sufficient support for the same proposition which was voted down earlier today, by simply placing another provision in the measure for the purpose of hamstringing the President of the United States, a provision which has nothing on the face of the earth to do with the proposition which has been the subject of debate here all the time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that the Senate itself started the matter of taking away personnel by not making appropriations?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have heard the Senator make that statement. I do not know whether it is true. It makes no difference who first started the practice; it is bad. It should never have been indulged in. So far as I am concerned, I have voted against such a proposition whenever I could.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that so far as Dave Lasser was concerned, the Senate was the body which took him off the pay roll, by cutting off the appropriation?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That may be true; I cannot dispute the Senator's statement. I do not recall the facts.

I do recall that, as to one of the men involved in the present matter, to wit, Goodwin Watson, the House put in the same provision last year, and I recall that the Senator from Kentucky and I and several other Senators even at that time opposed the provision on the ground

that it was outrageous, sumptuary legislation. I still think it is. I think it is as bad now as it was when the Senate voted 69 to nothing against it. I think it is just as bad now as when the Senate turned down the first conference report by a vote of 52 to 17; and certainly the proposition is identical to the one which the Senate turned down earlier today.

I think the Senate, in order to protect the orderly processes of free government, should adhere to its position, and should allow the House to take the responsibility, if it desires to do so, of defeating meritorious legislation by adhering to an indefensible position.

Mr. President, before I take my seat, I desire to say that I think the inclusion of a sumptuary provision, as the Senator from Kentucky described it, by the conferees in the attempt to pick up a few antiadministration votes on this infamous proposition, makes it even worse.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on several occasions I have voted against the attempt to deprive the three persons involved of their positions by cutting out the appropriation. I still think it is wrong; but I still feel that, beyond the interest of the three men involved, is the interest of the Government of the United States. The Government must carry on. Whatever law Congress may pass, some individual citizen of the country is involved, and many suffer; but, nevertheless, we still pass the law.

We now have before us a situation which involves the practical question, Will we, because of the fact that three particular persons are involved, jeopardize the passage of a bill which is of much importance to the country as a whole, forgetting about the purposes or the reasons for the bill itself or the effect which it must have?

Imagine the millions who will be affected or the thousands who will not receive their pay on the 1st of July, if the bill is not passed, because someone wants to protect three particular persons. Senators talk about believing in the rule of the majority, which is democracy at its best; and yet they object to a conference report because it would interfere with the welfare of three particular persons. Thousands are dying. They do not object, because they feel they are dying for the good of the whole country. Thousands are injured for the benefit of the whole country; thousands are making the supreme sacrifice for the benefit of the whole country; but at this moment we are willing to jeopardize the welfare of the Government itself and the making of salary payments to thousands of employees of the Government because we feel that three employees should not be discharged. Of late we have been hearing how England does things. England's way of doing things may be all right. Some may agree; some may not. Nevertheless, we have been told that England uses the method advocated in the report. England gets rid of the ones who are not wanted by denying appropriations.

Irrespective of all that, the conferees have worked hard. They have tried to carry out the Senate's idea on the proposition. On several occasions, I have

voted against dismissing the three particular men because I did not think the procedure was correct.

I still insist that government should prevail and should carry on, notwithstanding the suffering of individuals. In this instance, I shall stand by the conferees.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there has been considerable debate on this question. I realize that compromises are necessary, but we cannot compromise the Constitution of the United States. It has been stated that votes will be cast in favor of the compromise in order that the wings of the Executive may be clipped. I desire to say to the Senate now that in attempting to clip the wings of the Executive, the Senate will clip the Constitution of the United States. That is not the way to discharge the three men concerned. Above the portico of the Supreme Court Building, across the park, are engraved the words "Equal Justice Under Law."

The majority has no right to take away, illegally, the rights of the three men who now are a minority. That is not the way we do things under the Constitution. I do not believe that anyone should sacrifice the three men concerned. I am not pleading for the three men particularly; I do not know them. The question is not who they are, but how we are to proceed.

The Government will go on if we will simply adhere to the Constitution. Members of the Senate should be very careful, when they cast their votes, that they do not by their votes take away or compromise the rights of the men concerned, merely for the sake of clipping the wings of the President.

I desire to say now, upon the record, that I am in favor of the provision which is called the one for clipping the wings of the President, but I will not sacrifice a principle the sacrifice of which would be a violation of the provisions of the Constitution.

It has been said on this floor that the men concerned can go to court, that they can sue. However, that is not the way to proceed. Do we realize what it would mean to have this case carried to the Supreme Court of the United States?

I should like to see this body clip the wings of a man who hires men of this kind. That is the way to reach the issue, not to go down to the bottom and discharge the men, as is proposed to be done under the bill.

I hope every Senator who votes on the conference report will have in mind that if he attempts to clip the wings of the Executive by voting to accept the report, he will be clipping the wings of democracy.

Mr. McFARLAND. I appreciate the hard work the Senator from Tennessee has done upon this conference report. I know he is honest and conscientious in his efforts. However, a great deal has been said about clipping the wings of the President. When it comes to a proposition to clip the wings of the President, I desire to say that today we are engaged

in an all-out war, and this is no time to clip the wings of the President by limiting the use of money appropriated for emergency purposes during a war such as the one in which our country finds itself engaged.

The money is given to the President of the United States to meet emergencies caused by this war. We are planning a recess for 60 days. The President may need some of this money for some of the things for which this report may prohibit its use.

No matter what we may think of the President, I do not think we should clip the wings of the President in time of war by taking away emergency money. I voted for the conference report before, but I shall vote against it this time for that reason. I feel that we should stand by the President in this emergency.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in the discussion which has taken place here, apparently the inference has been left—whether intentionally or unintentionally makes little difference—that the conference committee has suddenly written something into the bill. Let me say to the Senate that when the bill first came before the Senate for consideration the language in question was written into the bill as an amendment. The provision limiting the use of the money which was voted to the Chief Executive was agreed to by the Senate. The bill went to conference, and the conferees eliminated the provision.

That limitation on the use of those funds was the act of a majority of the Senate. It is no compromise to put that language in the bill. It was inserted by a vote of a majority of the Senate. The conferees made the mistake of taking it out.

A great deal has been said about the clipping of wings. If there is need for the clipping of wings, they ought to be clipped; but this is not a clipping of wings. Under the Constitution, of which my friend speaks, the Congress is authorized to make appropriations of money. That power lies solely with the Congress. I am advised that the bill would place in the hands of the Chief Executive some \$69,000,000 by reappropriation, and in addition some \$25,000,000 of new appropriations.

What does this language provide? Why all the talk about clipping of wings? The language does not provide that the President may not use the funds for any purpose he sees fit, unless he should assume the position of using the money absolutely to destroy the force and effect of an act of Congress. What is the language of the provision? It is to the effect that the President may not use his funds to supplement an appropriation; and he may not use them for an agency of Government for which the Congress has denied an appropriation. I can understand the appeal which is made by some Senators on the ground of leaving the President free in time of war. Heaven knows, Congress has left him free. Let me say in all earnestness that if Congress has done anything which has

not met the approval of the people of the country, it has been to surrender its power to the Chief Executive.

Let me be frank. The time has come when reasonable restraints must be used if the powers of the Congress are to be safeguarded. I submit that it is not an unfair restraint, when we put into the hands of the President some \$90,000,000, to say that such funds shall not be used to defeat the will of Congress.

There has been much said about the three employees whom it is proposed to sever from the Government pay roll. I do not want to see wrong done to them, or to any other man. However, the matter of the relationship between the Congress and the Executive, and the matter of the welfare of the people of the country are not partisan questions. They are far more serious subjects than that of the three employees concerned, or any other three officeholders under the Government.

Mr. President, I submit that it is a fair restriction. It is a fair provision to say to the Chief Executive that these funds must not be used for any agency for which no appropriation has been made, or for which an appropriation has been refused by the Congress. I do not think it is unfair. I do not think it is a clipping of wings. I think that is a severe phrase to use.

As this restriction is now before the Senate, it is much less a restriction than this body voted into the bill before it went to conference, and before the conferees took the provision out. I submit that it is a fair restriction, a sound provision, and ought to stay in the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think we are losing sight of one of the important factors in the bill. It is true that it imposes a rather modest, very heavily qualified restriction on the use of certain funds by the Executive; but that restriction applies to only a small part of the funds which are available to him, and still permits him to use them for military purposes.

It is also true that the bill contains language regarding three Government employees. That language is distasteful to me. I heard the eloquent statement of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] a few days ago that that language smelled of ancient tombs in which liberty lies buried. I think that is an accurate description. I share the view of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that this is not the right way to treat people. But under our system of government, Mr. President, it is possible to attach riders to appropriation bills, whether we like it or not. I do not like it, but it is possible, and that is what has been done in this case.

With all the talk about the powers of the President and the treatment of the three individuals, I think we are losing sight of the fact that there are 5,500 employees of the Government in the District of Columbia, and about 100,000 other employees of the Federal Government in the United States whose source of livelihood is at stake in this bill. That is a

practical consideration, too. We have a contract with those people. We have held out to them the understanding that we would look after them. It is not right to discuss this question and never refer for a minute to what is, after all, the main purpose of the bill, which is to pay the salaries of servants of the Government.

I do not enjoy hearing it implied that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has not shown sufficient zeal in representing the viewpoint of the Senate. I have been a conferee at all the conferences, and I can certainly vouch for the rugged way in which he has stood up for the viewpoint of the Senate at all times. But we confront gentlemen who have very strong views of their own, and concessions must be made in order to obtain a result.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The Senator from Tennessee is indefatigable. I have been with him most of the time. He has been working morning, afternoon, and night on appropriation bills. He does not spare himself at all. I am certain that any other Member of the Senate who observed the Senator from Tennessee would subscribe to my statement that he has faithfully sought to represent the viewpoint of the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Is it not a fact that in spite of the repeated votes in the Senate on this question, because of the fact that the Senate conferees have yielded at every conference the House has never taken a record vote on this matter since the bill originally passed the House? Is not that correct?

Mr. LODGE. I am not familiar with what has transpired in the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is my impression that the Senate has yielded in every conference, and that there never has been a distinct vote in the House on the proposition, as there has been in the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know whether or not the House has taken a vote, but certainly it is not accurate to say that the Senate has yielded in every conference.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There have been several conference reports on which the Senate has yielded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not correct that the House acted on the bill originally, that the next action on the conference report was the refusal of the Senate conferees to accept the House language, that thereupon the conference report was brought before the Senate and was voted on by the Senate, but that the House conferees have never taken that matter back to the House for a vote? The Senate has voted three times on it, but the House conferees have not taken the matter back to the House for a vote.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not know what the House has done or has not done. All I desire to say is that the Senate conferees have tried sincerely and laboriously to reach an agreement which would meet with the wishes of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is a member of the conference committee. As a member of that committee, he knows that the matter has not been taken back to the House by the House conferees for a vote.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator is trying to get me to say what has taken place in the House. I do not know what happened there.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am not trying to get the Senator to say what has taken place in the House. However, as a conferee the Senator certainly knows what took place in connection with the conference report on the bill. The only vote which could be taken on the report was taken in the Senate, and it has not been taken back to the House by the conferees for a separate vote on the amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have voted against the conference report on two or three different occasions. I have always felt that the method proposed is not a proper one, although I must confess that in the early days when I first came to the Senate, several other Senators and I did take occasion, when there was a Republican majority in the Senate, to proposed to cut off the appropriation for an individual who was appointed by the then Republican President. The Senate voted to cut off the appropriation, and thereby the man was forced to quit his job.

I do not like the idea of proceeding in the manner proposed by the other body, but I wish to say that so far as its being unconstitutional is concerned, there is nothing unconstitutional about it. After all, the Congress of the United States, under the power given to it, can write in an appropriation bill any limitation it wants to write. There is nothing in the Constitution to prevent Congress from saying that money shall not be appropriated for a certain person.

I think the Senator from Tennessee is one of the most diligent and hard-working Members of this body. I think there is no doubt that he has done the very best he could do. I am not willing to tie up the salaries of hundreds of thousands of employees because of objections to three men who happen to be employees of the Government. When I vote upon the conference report I shall vote to agree to it. I think we all should vote in favor of agreeing to the report, and I should like to have a vote on it now.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, it seems to me that there are three or four features of this matter which do not appeal to a great many Senators. When the bill first came before the Senate it appeared to me to be outrageous that three men should be specifically named and it should provide that they should not be continued in office without giving them an opportunity to be heard, and that the Senate should pass upon the

matter without itself having an opportunity to know whether it was right or wrong to bar them. That was the impression I received.

We now have a great deal in addition. The majority leader has made the statement, in effect, that some sort of a sop has been handed out by way of a change in the bill for the purpose of gaining some votes by means of an agreement of some character. The Senator from Massachusetts has said that only a mild restriction on the President's powers is proposed. If votes are to be obtained by only a mild restriction, that merely indicates the cheapness of the votes. That does not change the situation in any way whatever.

Again, we all know that because of the fact that an attempt is being made to oppose the President, regardless of whatever may be the real motive, tomorrow morning the newspapers will herald the situation over the Nation as a fight against the President of the United States; and no doubt it will be a fairly sweet morsel to Hitler and Mussolini to know that a fight is made against the leader whom they so bitterly hate and that by such an inducement votes can be obtained in the Senate of the United States. It appears to me to be one of the saddest features of a situation of this sort that our enemies may know that one who is particularly opposed to them is also particularly hated by some of those who have votes in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, the fact that the proposed restriction is not severe does not change the seriousness of the situation which arises by reason of this matter. The distinguished junior Senator from Michigan has called to our attention the fact that these men have certain constitutional rights, and that their constitutional rights are being ignored. That seems to be a very small matter. However, if votes are to be changed as the second vote is taken today, I wonder what reason can be given except that the proposal is made for the purpose of clipping the wings of America's war leader, in the midst of war, and in connection with matters which may materially affect the war.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Tennessee if there has been any evidence that the three men have been guilty of any personal conduct which the committee considers to be inimical to the interests of the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that question has been discussed so often in this body that it seems to me that if the Senator had been here he would have heard it.

Mr. PEPPER. Have the men done anything in the performance of their duties which, so far as they personally were concerned, was inconsistent with the security of the country, or anything of that kind?

Mr. McKELLAR. They have been examined by the so-called Kerr committee of the House. Their own testimony was taken. It comprised the principal part of the testimony taken by that

committee. The men admitted that they had been members of a great many subversive organizations.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. They testified to that effect to such an extent that both the Dies committee and the Kerr committee strongly recommended to the House the action which the House subsequently took. Whether that testimony is true, I do not know.

I do not think the method adopted by the House is the proper way to handle the matter. However, if we want the bill passed so that worthy employees of the Government may receive their salaries, the only way to secure its passage is along these lines.

Mr. BONE. Will the Senator permit me to inquire about one matter?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. BONE. I have heard the expression employed that the funds under the bill we are considering were to be used to pay the salaries of employees. I am now advised by a Member of the Senate sitting near me that the bill contains funds only for certain increases allowed the employees.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BONE. And the employees will draw their regular salaries?

Mr. McKELLAR. They have been drawing the salaries, but not the increases which have been provided by law.

Mr. BONE. What I mean is that they are not going to starve to death?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know whether they are going to starve to death or not; I do not know them all, and I cannot say, but I know that \$143,000,000 is appropriated for them in this bill.

Mr. BONE. I am concerned with whether it affects the regular pay roll on July 1, the pay roll under which they have been previously paid. We should get that clear in our minds, because there is an impression here that if the bill should be rejected they would not draw any salary at all, and I do not understand that to be the case. They would draw their regular salaries as of July 1. I may be in error about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That has often been explained. Under the bill the three men in question will draw their regular salaries until November 15, and if the President reappoints them and the Senate confirms them, they will continue to draw their salaries regularly.

Mr. BONE. I am fearful the Senator has not gotten my question. As I understand, the bill contains an amount to make certain wage increases.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. It does not affect the regular salaries of the employees?

Mr. McKELLAR. That has been explained a dozen times.

Mr. BONE. Can the Senator tell me yes or no?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is absolutely true.

Mr. BONE. There are a number of Senators who have not understood it that way.

Mr. McKELLAR. It increases the salaries. I do not know how that could have been misunderstood.

Mr. BONE. But the argument has been made here today by Senators that if the conference report were rejected these men would not draw any salaries.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; I have not heard that.

Mr. BONE. Let us get it clear.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think any Senator who knows anything about the matter could have said that.

Mr. BONE. That is how obscure this whole matter is, because there are Senators sitting right around me who had that impression in their minds.

Mr. McKELLAR. They were entirely mistaken.

Mr. BONE. I wish to take the floor later in my own right.

Mr. MEAD. Will my distinguished friend from Florida yield to me for an observation?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. The Senator from Florida asked a moment ago whether there was anything in the record that these men may have done anything inimical to the welfare of the United States. I wish to say that there is much in the history of these men which may not be in the record. One of them served in the Navy of the United States during World War No. 1, and another one lost his son at Belleau Wood. That should be in the Record. If that is subversive, we should have a lot of that particular type of subversiveness. One of them, as I stated, served in the Navy during World War No. 1, and another lost his son at Belleau Wood.

Mr. PEPPER. That is the kind of thing I wanted to refer to. The three men are being condemned and convicted not only without trial, but for something which they did not do personally which was inimical to the public interest, so far as anyone has disclosed to my knowledge.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. When the first conference report was before the Senate I offered to yield my time to any Senator who could tell of his own knowledge anything about any of these three men, and no Senator accepted the challenge and the invitation. In other words, all we know about it is what we have been told by a subcommittee over in the House, and even the members of the full Committee on Appropriations in the House, when they inserted this provision in the bill, were not apprised of the record before the Kerr committee. I have been told that the other members of the full Committee on Appropriations were not even given access to the facts, yet we are asked to pass what amounts to a bill of attainder on the basis of what somebody else thinks on evidence we have not heard and about which we know nothing.

Mr. PEPPER. If I know anything that is supposed to be inherent in American character it is the principle of tolerance and decency and fair play. Because on hearsay evidence these men are supposed to have belonged to some kind of an organization, the greatest offense of which I suspect was that they favored the nationalistic government in Spain instead of the Fascist government, because they were merely reputed to be members and perhaps admitted membership in an organization which had that faith—as I did, and as many other Senators on this floor did—they are being condemned by the American Congress and kicked out of employment by the American Government.

Mr. President, what has become of tolerance in America? Are Senators going to ask what kind of organization a Senator or citizen belongs to when he has not personally done anything which makes him obnoxious as a citizen or as an elector?

I suspect that if Thomas Jefferson had been on the Federal pay roll he would have been condemned by the Dies committee and the Kerr committee as not only an atheist or agnostic, but as a Communist; yet he preached to America the spirit of tolerance, which has become ingrained in American character as a fundamental American characteristic.

We talk about the four freedoms, including freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom of conscience, yet the Senate, which is called the greatest deliberative body in the world, is asked to condemn men without trial, not because of culpable conduct, but because of their affiliation with an organization which indicated their own philosophy and opinion.

Mr. President, the American Congress will be condemned before the world as intolerant and as believing in a kind of fascism which we profess to fight, if we allow ourselves to commit this kind of offense. It will give encouragement to a resurgence of all the old animosities which have stood for intolerance in this country from its inception.

Talking about democratic government, talking about the citadel of freedom, talking about the last stronghold of independence, are we to kick out of an agency three men, one of whom served his country in its uniform in a fight against tyranny a generation ago, and another gave his son to his country's cause, because they had opinions, and are we to say they are ineligible to hold office under the American Government?

Mr. President, that would do more harm than the \$71,000,000,000 appropriation we made here today could do good, because we would belie the essence of American character here in the heart of the Nation, in the Congress, if we committed ourselves to that kind of conduct.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I join heartily in the remarks of the last speaker, and much else that has been said this afternoon. It may seem anticlimax for me to raise the point I now wish to raise, but during the course of the discussion the fact gradually emerged that it is not a question of the Senate giving away to the President of the United States. The question arises whether the Senate is abandoning its rights to the House of Representatives. If the House of Representatives can by riders impose a condition such as that imposed in the bill now under discussion, it can impose any other condition, and the same appeal can be made.

Suppose they imposed the condition that none of this money should be available unless three Senators, the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from New Mexico, and the Senator from Massachusetts, for example, should resign from the Senate. Would we hear these appeals to pass the bill because the fate of those three Senators would be of minor concern in comparison with the livelihood of hundreds of thousands of employees of the Government? There are principles involved which far outweigh the temporary interests of even a large number of employees, and one of the principles is, if Senators believe strongly in a principle, are they going to abandon it because the House of Representatives makes an unreasonable request that they shall abandon it?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I do not really believe that the House has been unreasonable. I believe the Senate has been more or less unreasonable with the House. The House has adjourned and its Members have gone home to enjoy the evening with their families. The House has not yet been called upon, as I understand, to have a yea-and-nay vote on this particular measure.

Mr. GREEN. That is the very point I am coming to.

Mr. MEAD. I really believe we should invite the House to vote on the question at a convenient hour tomorrow. I believe the House, realizing the record of patience we have made, will, if given an opportunity, agree with us and settle this question without delay.

Mr. GREEN. That was the point I was coming to. A great deal has been said by the chairman of the Senate conferees and by some of his fellow conferees concerning how hard they have fought to sustain the position of the Senate. In spite of the three votes had in the Senate, the Senate conferees have returned, but never once, so far as I have learned, have they insisted or even requested the House conferees to go back to the House and ask for another vote on the question by the House. As the Senator from New York has just stated, who knows but that the House might recede from its position? We do not know that the matter was fully considered by the House when the measure was originally passed. In view of the fact that the wages of 100,000 employees, or whatever the number may be, hang in the balance, the House may recede, realizing that its demand is unreasonable, and that it cannot force this un-

reasonable condition on the Senate at the sacrifice of principle. I should really like to ask the Senator from Tennessee, who, as I understand, is the chairman of the Senate conferees, whether the Senate conferees have ever tried to insist that the House conferees take this matter back to the House?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, Mr. President, we have done so, and we were met with the flat refusal that the House conferees would not take it back to the House. The Senator from Rhode Island has served as a conferee in many conferences. I say to him or to any other Senator who thinks he can manage to bring the House to the terms of the Senate, that I should like to have him take my place. I will resign my place as a conferee instantly, and allow any Senator who thinks he can change the attitude of the House with respect to this matter, to make the attempt. I shall step out as a conferee immediately after the vote which is about to be taken, and let any Senator try it. If the Senate shall again reject the report nothing would give me more happiness than to see my good friend the Senator from Rhode Island as one of the conferees in opposition to the House position on this matter. I wish to say to him that in my judgment he would not have any better success than I have had.

Mr. GREEN. The Senator from Tennessee has not answered the point I made. It was not whether the conferees would withdraw from their position. It is whether the House conferees would refuse to take the question back to the House so it might vote on it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senate conferees have made such an attempt time and again.

Mr. GREEN. I think the Senate of the United States will have fallen quite low if it abandons a matter of principle—and by its vote I must assume that it regarded the question to be a matter of principle—merely because a group of conferees refuses to take a question back to the House. In other words, if the small number represented by the conferees—not the House of Representatives itself, but the small number of Representatives appointed as conferees—is to be unreasonable and is to refuse to take the matter back to the House when it has been voted by the Senate three times, it seems to me we shall be groveling at the feet of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. Not just yet. In a minute I shall yield. It seems to me we are lacking all sense of the proper dignity of this legislative body, supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world, if we fail to take the action I propose.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I simply wish to ask the able Senator from Rhode Island if he does not think that the Senate conferees would adequately express the will of the Senate if they should merely notify the

House Members that the Senate is going to stand pat with respect to this issue, and continue to do so.

Mr. GREEN. It seems to me that instead of now receding after three test votes, in which the Senate has reaffirmed its position, it would be better to send the conferees back with instructions to demand that this matter be taken back to the House of Representatives by the House conferees, and let us see what happens on another vote in the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If in the impending vote the conference report is voted down, as it has been voted down before, I shall ask unanimous consent of the Senate to be discharged as one of the conferees on the part of the Senate, and shall further ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who is on the Appropriations Committee, take my place and endeavor to induce the House to agree to vote on the matter.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. What will be the status of the three men if the conference report is agreed to?

Mr. McKELLAR. The three men will continue to be employed as they are now until November 15. If prior to that time the three men are reappointed to their positions by the President, and their nominations are sent to the Senate and confirmed, they will continue to serve. If the President should not send their names to the Senate, or if the Senate should fail to confirm their nominations after their names are sent to the Senate, then on November 15 their terms of office would expire.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the Senator.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Question.

Mr. GREEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee another question. I know that he will be glad to answer and illuminate any question.

Mr. McKELLAR. In my extremely tired condition after working day and night trying to secure the passage of various appropriation measures, I am afraid I cannot illuminate any question, but I shall be very glad to try to answer any question.

Mr. GREEN. Then I shall not trouble the Senator. I know that he has done much hard work, and I do not want him to understand from my remarks that I think he has not. If the parliamentary situation were such that I could do so, I should like to move to amend the pending motion, to the effect that the conferees be instructed to hold another conference and demand that this question be submitted to the House.

Mr. AIKEN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I recorded as having voted on this question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as having voted.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Vermont has voted in the negative. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President—
Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. BRIDGES asked for the regular order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk be directed to continue to call the roll.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I make a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Chair announced that the Senator from Rhode Island was on his feet, and he was recognized, so even if the call of the roll had been begun, it was automatically vacated when the Chair recognized the Senator from Rhode Island. I make the point of order that the Senator from Rhode Island had the floor, and the matter is now open for discussion.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. One could not conceive of a more unfortunate time to accuse a person of an offense which reflected upon his patriotism and love of country than during a war. The Members of the Senate have before them certain vague charges, implications, innuendoes. As I stand here at my desk I am not aware of the nature of the charges against these three men, except that there have been most unfortunate connotations. If we remove these men from their positions we will bruit whatever these vague charges are and have been. They have been bruited all around both Halls of Congress.

Mr. President, there is nothing more priceless than a man's good name. If we sustain the charges by removing the men, which is precisely what we shall do if we accept the conference report, we shall not only bring down upon them opprobrium and reproach, but we shall visit on their children and their grandchildren a terrible stigma which they will never live down. A man who is worthy to be called a man is jealous of his honor. Imputations of dishonor have led to many unfortunate things in the world. I think we have had some unpleasant discussions because it has been said time after time that if the Senate does not agree to the conference report, thousands of employees will not have money with which to buy food. That is not true. The fact is that the bill provides for salary increases, but at the price of ruining the good names of three men. Their good names are their priceless possessions, which do not belong to us. No Member of the Senate would permit such a thing to be done to his own son. Every Member of the Senate would fight it until he fell dead on this floor, before he would ever let that be done to his own flesh and blood. Yet we would blithely do it to three of our citizens in order to assure the payment of an increase in salary to some employees, but at the price of the honor of those men.

I had hoped the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would be in the Chamber at this time, because I desired

to discuss with him one matter with relation to his remarks. In connection with his remarks about duties and obligations and what it means to visit punishment on others, let me call the Senate's attention to one little incident in American history, to be multiplied 100 times.

During the administration of Theodore Roosevelt a naturalized Greek by the name of Perdicardis was captured by a Moorish bandit by the name of Raisuli. Roosevelt sent a cablegram, "I want Perdicardis alive or Raisuli dead." He got Perdicardis alive; but if he had not gotten Perdicardis alive, there might have been a war. President Roosevelt might have caused the lives of hundreds of American boys to be sacrificed in order to defend the proposition that an American citizen had a right to go anywhere in the world and to maintain the freedom of his body.

In the days of the Roman Empire, a man who was a Roman citizen went with safety anywhere under the flag of Rome, under the imperial eagle of the Roman Empire. He was free. It meant something to him to be an independent and free citizen of Rome, and it meant something to him to have the rights and independence of his family and children preserved.

Mr. President, it means nothing to say that these men could be vindicated after we had besmirched their characters. A man is entitled to justice at the hands of the Senate. That is the attitude I take regarding the matter. I believe the problem is not complicated, but is elemental in its simplicity.

I will not vote to put the stamp of illegality, not only on a man, but on his children and his children's children, so that people will read it, and so that his children will never again be able to say, "My father was an honorable man who occupied an honorable position under the Stars and Stripes."

The Senate has no right to do that; and I, for one, am willing to forego the risk of not having increased pay go to certain employees, because to me it is more important to stand here and uphold the rights of men under freedom in America, and to prevent the sacrifice of the most important principle in the world, the principle for which our boys are dying now all over the world.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who, if present, would vote "nay." Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHANDLER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent attending the funeral of his brother.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association, at Ottawa, Canada, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would vote "yea."

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are absent as members of the special committee of the Senate attending a meeting of the Canada branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] has been called from the city on important business. If present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—32		
Ball	Gurney	Robertson
Bankhead	Hawkes	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Scruggam
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Lodge	Taft
Buck	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Vandenberg
Caraway	McKellar	Wheeler
Chavez	McNary	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
George	Revercomb	

NAYS—35

Alken	Hill	Murray
Barkley	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Bone	La Follette	Overton
Butler	Langer	Pepper
Chandler	Lucas	Radcliffe
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Shipstead
Danaher	Maloney	Truman
Downey	Maybank	Tunnell
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Green	Millikin	Wallgren
Gulley	Moore	Willis
Hatch	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—29

Andrews	Davis	Smith
Austin	Ellender	Thomas, Idaho
Bailey	Gerry	Thomas, Utah
Barbour	Gillette	Tobey
Bilbo	Glass	Tydings
Burton	Hayden	Van Nuys
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Walsh
Byrd	O'Daniel	Wiley
Clark, Idaho	Reed	Wilson
Connally	Reynolds	

So the report was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from further service on the conference committee; and in that connection I also ask unanimous consent that my good friend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] be appointed in my place.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee is not serious in that request.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very serious about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the Senator ought to withdraw from the conference. I know what a hard job he has; but still, judging from the last roll call, he is making progress. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not making progress when I realize that the Senate pages will go off the pay roll on July 1. There is no money with which to pay them. There are 21 of them. They will go off the pay roll, as will the pages in the House, the school teachers of the District of Columbia, and thousands of other employees.

I feel that I have never done my duty any better than I have done it in connection with this matter. I have made every effort to secure the adoption of the conference report. The Senate has turned it down at least three times. Under those circumstances, especially when my distinguished friend from Rhode Island says that he could have the House conferees and the House Members change their views, and that it could be easily managed if there were a proper representative of the Senate on the committee, I should be delighted if he would accept my place, and persuade the House to change its view at once.

I ask unanimous consent that that arrangement be made.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, when the Senator from Tennessee displays the vigor he does, and the happy phrasing of which he is capable, I know that the time has not yet arrived to replace him. As the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, every time he brings back this report he makes progress. I hope that the next time it will be taken back to the House, and that progress can be made there. I do not believe that we could do better than to keep the same conferees, with the instruction—not necessarily formal, but informal—that the Senate conferees try to persuade the

House conferees to take this measure back to the House.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee will remain on the conference committee. He is making progress. Eventually he will prevail.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, Senators are very kind. I have done everything a mortal man could do with the limitations which I have, not only to get this bill through but to get all other appropriation bills through by tomorrow night. I took a great deal of pride in that ambition. I shall be very much disappointed if this bill does not get through. But the Senate is determined about the matter. It has said so time and again, although each time a few more Senators voted for the conference report. Perhaps if more Senators would study it, there would be more votes in favor of it.

I am sorry for the page boys. I wish to tell them that I did everything I could for them, and for the boys over in the House, for the school teachers, the policemen, and thousands of other employees throughout the country, who not only will not receive any increase in salary, but will not receive their salaries. I am very sorry. I meant no harm in being persistent. I greatly regret that the Senate has not stood by the Senate conferees. Tomorrow I shall insist on some other Senator taking my place.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know that there is anything further to come before the Senate—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Russell in the chair). The Chair has a message from the House of Representatives to lay before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Before the Chair lays the message before the Senate, let me say to the Senator from Tennessee and to the Senate that we all appreciate the hard work he has done. I especially appreciate it. I know how hard-working the Senator always is, and how interested he is in anything he undertakes.

This is not the first time that the two Houses have had difficulty over an appropriation bill. In my service I have seen many occasions when it was necessary to pass a continuing resolution in order to pay Government employees until an appropriation bill could be passed to pay their salaries out of the Treasury. These employees do not draw their pay until the 15th of the month. They are already provided for up until day after tomorrow. It does not seem to me impossible that the conferees of the two Houses may get together. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not weary in what I am sure he thinks is well-doing. On the last vote he had almost a majority of the Senate. I hope the differences between the two Houses may be settled.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, for the past 2 months I do not think there has been a single day that I have not

worked 12 hours, largely on appropriation bills. I take pride in my work on the bills. I take pride in the magnificent help which I have received from the other members of the Committee on Appropriations. They have done a wonderful work under very great difficulties. The House sent over some of the bills a little later than usual, and that has made our work more difficult.

I have tried my best to be honest, fair, and just in every way. When my colleagues turn down a report of this kind, it makes me feel that perhaps I should not be a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have been turned down in the Senate so many times that every time I see a defeat coming I merely back up to it. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator makes a great mistake, as leader, in not standing by committees of the Senate when they make reports. I have always understood that it was one of the duties of the leader to stand by the majority of a committee.

Yesterday my distinguished friend announced at the very beginning that he would fight the conference report. He said that he did not know anything about it, and had not as yet examined into it; yet he made a powerful speech against members of the Appropriations Committee. He made me feel rather downhearted and weary.

When a bill is reported, either from a conference committee or from a Senate committee, I have always felt that unless there was something very unusual about it, or something to which Senators conscientiously objected, the committee should be given reasonable support. It certainly should not have the active and terrific opposition of the leader of the party which is undertaking to put these measures through. I have tried to act in the best of faith. I have tried not to lose my temper, and I do not believe I have lost it at any time during this entire controversy. Again and again I have tried to attain certain results; but it seemed that the more I tried the more vigorous the opposition became. When the terrific opposition came today, with a strong speech from the majority leader, he certainly lined up a number of votes against the conference report. Otherwise I believe the conference report would have been agreed to earlier in the day.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I cannot yield now.

Mr. President, I cannot ignore the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not mean to reflect on the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that what the Senator said was in the utmost of kindness. However, when I rose yesterday I did not say that I did not know anything about the subject. In the last Congress the same question was brought before the Senate. Only two men were involved then, and not three. At that time I took the same position

that I took yesterday and have taken today. I do not recall the position which was taken by the Senator from Tennessee in the last Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was the same as that of the Senator from Kentucky. However, we were both overruled, and Mr. Lasser went out.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not referring to Mr. Lasser. I am referring to Mr. Dodd and Mr. Watson, who were eliminated by the House in the last Congress. We made a fight in the Senate to defeat the provision affecting those two men, and we were successful. I took the same position then that I take now, that such a provision is unconstitutional. I have a deep and conscientious conviction upon the subject.

I appreciate the Senator's mild stricture concerning my opposition to the position of the committee. Frequently I am conscientiously in doubt about what attitude I should properly take with regard to bills reported by committees. I think I have frequently offended some of my colleagues, especially those on this side of the Chamber, by standing by committees sometimes when I might have been justified in voting against them. However, in a matter of this nature I must remember that I have taken an oath, as has every other Senator, to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. I do not think that I am required to stultify my own convictions on a constitutional question in order to stand by a committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say with the utmost kindness that I do not think the Senator from Kentucky should blame himself too much for having stood by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. As we all know, especially in the past few months, the Senator from Kentucky has not upheld the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not kept books on the subject, but I do not recall any particular instances. I do not suppose that the fact that I am majority leader necessarily makes me an automaton, and therefore I am required to vote to support every committee report.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have often voted against my own committees when they have reported bills which I could not support.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. With all due respect to the Appropriations Committee, it seems to me that it is more important for the majority leader to stand by the Senate than to stand by the Appropriations Committee or any other minor segment of the Senate.

As one who has always been opposed to this type of legislation, I am very grateful for the support of the majority leader. I am glad that he returned to the Senate in time to render very valuable support in the last two or three

defeats of the Appropriations Committee which have taken place.

I also suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that while the Senator from Kentucky was necessarily absent because of illness, the Senate, under its own steam, defeated the effort to include this provision in an appropriation bill by a conference report two or three times. As a matter of fact, we have actually lost ground since the Senator from Kentucky returned. We have not defeated the proposal by as great a margin since the Senator returned as we did while he was away. I do not believe it is fair for the Senator from Tennessee to upbraid the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Senator has said is undoubtedly true. No longer than an hour ago I expressed the view that instead of the Senator from Tennessee chiding me he ought to thank me for my opposition, because he got more votes with my opposition than he got while I was absent.

Yesterday I rose and made the statement that I had been necessarily absent when the question was before the Senate on two previous occasions. On one occasion the Senate voted 69 to nothing to eliminate this provision. Had I been present the vote would have been 70 to nothing. On another occasion, when the conference report was defeated 52 to 17, I was still absent. Had I been present, my vote would have made it 53 to 17.

Having been absent and not having had an opportunity to vote or express myself on those two occasions, yesterday I felt that I ought to express my views. For many years I have had a deep and abiding conviction on this question. I do not ask any other Senator to vote against the conference report. I merely explain why I voted against it. The Senator from Tennessee flatters me when he says that my speech influenced the vote of any other Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Missouri are rather hard on themselves. I think the Senator from Kentucky certainly defeated this measure twice today. If there is any satisfaction to be gained from defeating an appropriation bill of this kind, the Senator from Kentucky is entitled to a full measure of satisfaction for having defeated this worthy measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I obtained satisfaction from the defeat, the Senator from Tennessee should obtain satisfaction from a defeat by a smaller margin.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I think perhaps the Senator from Kentucky has misunderstood the situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I frequently do. [Laughter.]

Mr. TUNNELL. I listened to the Senator from Tennessee, and I thought that whatever reflection he might have made on any Senator was on the leader of the party which is trying to put this bill through. I did not think that he meant the Senator from Kentucky. I thought

perhaps he was referring to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not attempt to elucidate or even illuminate that subject.

Mr. McKELLAR. I said the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I did not mean the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] when I said the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator from Oregon will join me in the hope that he and I do not become confused. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield, but I should like to conclude this discussion and make a motion for a recess.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am in the mood to recess, but I hope the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Kentucky, and the Senator from Tennessee will not become confused. I hope that the Senator from Tennessee, who is in charge of the bill, will stick it out. We are making progress. It will take a little time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I join in that hope.

SALE OF HORSE MEAT OR FOOD PRODUCTS IN THE DISTRICT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 832) relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia, which was, on page 2, to strike out all of section 3, and insert:

Sec. 3. The health officer of the District of Columbia, subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, is authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. BRIDGES. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Russell in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

John M. Houston, of Kansas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years from August 27, 1943 (reappointment).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James B. M. McNally to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph T. Votava to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Horace Friertson to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George E. Proudfit to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Reuben Gosnell to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 30, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 29 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John S. Service, of Ohio, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the

Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Armond W. Scott, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia. (He is now serving in this post under an appointment which expires July 14, 1943.)

Thomas D. Quinn, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, vice Hobart Newman, whose term expires August 21, 1943.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Richard J. Cullen, from the State of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at \$4,600 per annum, in the New York regional office.

Huxley Madeheim, from the State of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at \$4,600 per annum, in the New York regional office.

George C. Chesney, from the District of Columbia, to be head industrial consultant in the Bureau of Manpower Utilization, at \$6,500 per annum, in the Washington office.

Ernest L. Marbury, from the State of Alabama, to be deputy regional manpower director, at \$5,500 per annum, in the Alabama State office.

Joseph S. Dorton, from the State of North Carolina (previously confirmed for the position of area director at \$4,600 per annum), to be deputy regional manpower director, at \$5,600 per annum, in the North Carolina State office.

Glenn L. Bobbitt, from the State of North Carolina, to be area chief of training, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Raleigh area office.

Leo H. Carney, from the State of Pennsylvania, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Erie area office.

Harold S. Woodley, from the State of Michigan, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Battle Creek area office.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Don Elwood Lowry, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from September 4, 1942.

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Maj. Wilson Turner Douglas, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1943.

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Curtis Alan Schrader, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 10, 1942.

TO AIR CORPS

Capt. Victor Haller King, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to the examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.)

To be lieutenant colonels, with rank from July 1, 1943:

Maj. Paul Americus Harris, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Jefferson Cleveland Campbell, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

X Maj. Hugh Franklin Conrey, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

X Maj. Edwin Clark Maling, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).

Maj. O. D. Wells, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

X Maj. Frank Celestine Meade, Signal Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Paul Wallace Cole, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

X Maj. Charles Speir Lawrence, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Clarence Matthew Tomlinson, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Julian Buckner Haddon, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Clem Oliver Gunn, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

X Maj. Wilber Russell Ellis, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Donald Weldon Brann, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. George Bernhard Anderson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Walter John Wolfe, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

X Maj. Roswell Emory Round, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Lester Frank Watson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. William Edwin Vecqueray, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

X Maj. Haynie McCormick, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

X Maj. Albert Theodore Wilson, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Cornelius Emmett O'Connor, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

X Maj. Hartwell Matthew Elder, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Park Holland, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

X Maj. John Gross, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Thomas Russell Howard, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Samuel James Adams, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).

X Maj. Albert Gillian Kelly, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).

Maj. Wayne McVeigh Pickels, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Owen Russell Marriott, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Frank Joseph Vida, Infantry (temporary colonel).

X Maj. Harold Patrick Henry, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

X Maj. Frederic Pierce Van Duzee, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Burns Beall, Infantry (temporary colonel).

X Maj. John Bartlett Hess, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Allen Francis Haynes, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Harold Gaslin Sydenham, Infantry (temporary colonel).

X Maj. George Windle Read, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel).

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 2, 1943:

X Maj. Francis Hudson Oxx, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Thomas Henry Stanley, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

X Maj. Donald Greeley White, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. William Weston Bessell, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Charles George Holle, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. John Wylie Moreland, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Wayne Stewart Moore, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Henry Franklin Hannis, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Edward Albert Routheau, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

X Maj. Wilson Burnett Higgins, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

X Maj. Frederic Lord Hayden, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Warren Cressman Rutter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Harold Frank Handy, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Richard Clare Partridge, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Edward John McGaw, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Harold Thomas Miller, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Tyree Rivers Horn, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Joseph Leo Langevin, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. William Hardy Hill, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Louis Jacob Claterbos, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Auguste Rhu Taylor, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary colonel).
 Maj. James Kenneth Mitchell, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Frank Andrew Henning, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Ewart Gladstone Plank, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 Maj. James Malcolm Lewis, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Bernard Linn Robinson, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. John Robert Culleton, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. James Goodrich Renno, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. Charles Steinhart Whitmore, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Maj. James Hobson Stratton, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Lee Armstead Denson, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Lawrence Granger Smith, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Edward Haviland Lastayo, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. George DeGraaf, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Lathrop Ray Bullene, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. James Alexander Samouce, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Maj. William Wallace Ford, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. George Dewey Vanture, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 ×Maj. Pastor Martelino, Philippine Scouts (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Harry Earl Fisher, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Donald Sylvester Burns, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Donald James Leehey, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Joseph Eugene Harriman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general).
 Maj. George Joseph Loupret, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Thomas Arnett Roberts, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Verne Donald Mudge, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
 ×Maj. John Loren Goff, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. Francis Henry Morse, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Edward Macon Edmonson, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Maj. William Gordon Holder, Coast Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Halstead Clotworthy Fowler, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 ×Maj. Lyman Louis Lemnitzer, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general).
 Maj. Leslie Burgess Downing, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. William Ignatius Brady, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Eugene Martin Link, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. John States Seybold, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 Maj. William Harry Bartlett, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Donald Breen Herron, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Edward Clinton Gillette, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Russell Owen Smith, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Rex Van Den Corput, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Homer Watson Kiefer, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Maj. James Myron McMillin, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Joseph Harris, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. John George Howard, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 ×Maj. Robert Hugh Kreuter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Laurence Wood Bartlett, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Donald Frank Stace, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Reynolds Johnston Burt, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 Maj. John Dickerson Mitchell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Clarence Henry Schabacker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Fred Lebbeus Hamilton, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. John Francis Cassidy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. John Foxhall Sturman, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Joseph Jacob Billo, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Clarence Clemens Clendenen, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. William Carleton McFadden, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Eugene Collum Johnston, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Maj. James Hess Walker, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
 ×Maj. Lyman Lincoln Judge, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Frank Needham Roberts, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Francis Henry Lanahan, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Lawrence Edward Schick, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Courtney Parker Young, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. Henry Chester Hine, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. William Price Withers, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Frederick Robert Pitts, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Sherman Vitus Hasbrouck, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Crump Garvin, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Hamilton Peyton Ellis, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Thomas Dresser White, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).
 ×Maj. Frederick Mixon Harris, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Dwight Acker Rosebaum, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Kenneth Gilpin Hoge, Adjutant General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. Richard Candler Singer, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 ×Maj. Aladin James Hart, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. William Richter Tomey, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. Joseph Honore Rousseau, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. Lawrence Joseph Carr, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Maurice Wiley Daniel, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Alexander Hamilton Perwein, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Clovis Ethelbert Byers, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
 ×Maj. Oscar Raymond Johnston, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. George Andrew Rehm, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Edward Carl Engelhart, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. Charles Whitney West, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Park Brown Herrick, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. Herbert Carl Reuter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Harold Edward Smyser, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Esher Claflin Burkart, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Thomas Eginton Whitehead, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Alexander George, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Charles Kenon Gailey, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Francis William Farrell, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Wilmer Brinton Merritt, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Harry Clark Wisehart, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Charles Merton Adams, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. John Ferral McBlain, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).
 ×Maj. Richard Meade Costigan, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 ×Maj. Gustave Harold Vogel, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Basil Girard Thayer, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Edward Joseph Sullivan, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).
 Maj. James Perrine Barney, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 ×Maj. Wilbur Sturtevant Nye, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Charles Harlan Swartz, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Leland Stuart Smith, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Carl Frederick Duffner, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Millard Pierson, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Harlan Thurston McCormick, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Ray Olander Welch, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. Julian Erskine Raymond, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. George Honnen, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
 Maj. Charles Porter Amazeen, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. Edward Thomas Williams, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Frank Thweatt Searcy, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Alan Lockhart Fulton, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Terence John Tully, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
 Maj. William Earl Crist, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
 Maj. Claude Monroe McQuarrie, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Maj. William Lemuel Mitchell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Maj. Escalus Emmert Elliott, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
 Maj. Milton Cogswell Shattuck, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Maj. Joseph Vincent de Paul Dillon, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary brigadier general).
 Maj. Hayden Adriance Sears, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Maj. John Thomas Lynch, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. John Black Reybold, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

×Maj. William Dickey Long, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Henry Irving Hodes, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Maj. William Joel Tudor Yancey, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Maj. Leon Eugene Lichtenwalter, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Sidney Rae Hinds, Infantry (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Halley Grey Maddox, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Harold Todd Turnbull, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Hugo Peoples Rush, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Wray Bertrand Avera, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Maj. Charles Fox Ivins, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Walter Daniel Buile, Infantry (temporary colonel).

×Maj. John Taylor Ward, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. John Elmer Reiersen, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Maj. Henry Jackson Hunt, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).

To be captain with rank from July 15, 1943

First Lt. Adrian Leonard Hoebeke, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

To be first lieutenant with rank from July 1, 1943

Second Lt. Weldon Marion James, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. John Norton Reynolds, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. William Elza McEntire, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Bryan Brand Harper, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Second Lt. Joseph Herbert Paul, Air Corps (temporary major).

×Second Lt. William John Feallock 2d, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. William Murray Hendrix, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Alvin Edward Hebert, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Second Lt. George Miles McNeese, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Joseph Richard Ambrose, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Ogden Nelson Pratt, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Donald K. Bennett, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Richard Condie Sanders, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Second Lt. Ernest Roderic Manierre, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert Fleming Harris, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Rollin Murray Winingham, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Malcolm McMillan Heber, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert Lee Baseler, Air Corps (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Harold Caldwell Smelser, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Gerhard John Schriever, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Adolf Milton Wright, Air Corps (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Cecil James Looke, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Preston Breckenridge, Air Corps (temporary major).

×Second Lt. George Edward Glober, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. William Edward Hubbard 2d, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Charles Afton Gayle, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Second Lt. J. Garrett Jackson, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Carrell Thurman Murrell, Air Corps (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Edgar Allen Romberg, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Orville Herman Rehmann, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Orie Olin Schurter, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Frederick William Baum, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Ralph Monroe Fawcett, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Stanley Richard Vosper, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. William Ellsworth Boyd, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Phillip John Kuhl, Air Corps (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Alexander George Evanoff, Air Corps (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Jerry Dentler Page, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Rolfe Henry Anthis, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Joseph Austin Cunningham, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Ralph Amos Reeve, Air Corps (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Dorr Ellsworth Newton, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Donald Leonard Clark, Air Corps (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Maurice Leslie Martin, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Thomas Stanley Jeffrey, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. James Herbert Batte, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Herman Walter Wright Lange, Field Artillery (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Harold Stanley Griffith, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Alfred Washburn Bruneau, Cavalry (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Cook Tredennick, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Jack Conrad Miller, Infantry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. John Hall Livingston, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Second Lt. Hunter LeGear Stockton, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Jene Earl Mills, Field Artillery (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Woodrow Bryan Sigley, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Pratt Alexander Warren, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Warren Randall King, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Robert Gray Platt, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Leslie Harness, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Peter Denisevich, Infantry (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Phillip Archie Hatten, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Gilbert Warren Curl, Infantry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Alfred Lincoln Brassel, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Ernest Lester Ramme, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. George Cobb Benjamin, Cavalry (temporary major).

Second Lt. James Blair Green, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert Harlan Bull, Infantry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. George Burbank Webster, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Ellsworth Andrew Cragholm, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Emerson Wallace Grant, Cavalry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. George Blatchford Robinson, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Clifford Ellwood Lippincott, Cavalry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Stephen Dana Young, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. George Francis Carter, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. William Kethley Gillmore, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Jacob Lewis Riley, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Cyril Dean Sterner, Infantry (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Marion Walton Walker, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Donald Alvin Kersting, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Charles Walker Sample, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Benjamin Grant Taylor, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Richard Irvine Manning, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Thomas Addis Emmet Moseley, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Ralph Sheridan Eldridge, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Misha Nicholas Kadick, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. John Storey Sandiland, Infantry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Robert Charles Hilpert, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Joseph Houghton Collart, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Second Lt. William Scandrett, Signal Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Darrel Gee Costello, Infantry (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Bergen Brokaw Hovell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Francis Woodrow Adams, Cavalry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Paul Henry Symbol, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. David Samuel Daley, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Louis Howard Rensijac, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Thomas Lanier McKnight, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Jack Finney Lane, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Charles Mix Gilbert, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Thomas O'Connor Blakeney, Infantry (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Robert Jackson Natzel, Infantry (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Harry Hammond Walker, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Charles Douglas Johnston, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Otto Bismarck Cloudt, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Harry Paller Infantry (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Eric Edward Duckstad, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Walter Edwin Winter, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Royal Linehan, Air Corps (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Stephen Davenport McElroy, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Harold Diedrich Hansen, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Emil Paul Eschenburg, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert Edward Arn, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Francis Meisinger Libershal, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Second Lt. Edward Francis Hubbard, Air Corps (temporary major).

×Second Lt. John Luverne Richardson, Air Corps (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Ben King Humphrey, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Roger McKee Crow, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Frank Edward Sullivan, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Donald Thomas Bennink, Air Corps (temporary major).
 ×Second Lt. William Alfred Filer, Air Corps (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Horace Albert Hanes, Air Corps (temporary major).
 ×Second Lt. Stuart Moss Porter, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
 Second Lt. Alvan Neavitt Moore, Air Corps (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Frank Lee Wood, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
 ×Second Lt. William Cone Mahoney, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
 ×Second Lt. William Chester Goers, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
 Second Lt. David William Iunghuhn, Infantry (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. William Darrel Cavness, Infantry (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. Lester Bennett Johnson, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
 Second Lt. Parker Ewan Connor, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
 ×Second Lt. Richard Sears Lovering, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant).
 Second Lt. Elmer Austin Dixon, Air Corps (temporary captain).
 ×Second Lt. MacPherson Morgan, Air Corps (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Joseph Pancratius Fagan, Infantry (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Edward Kennedy Lovelace, Infantry (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. John Edward Unverferth, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Paul Edward Alban, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
 ×Second Lt. George Thomas Metcalf, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. Earl William Edwards, Infantry (temporary major).
 ×Second Lt. Bert Perrin, Infantry (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. Raymond Thomas Shelby, Infantry (temporary major).
 ×Second Lt. Ernest Henry Lorenz, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. Frank Norton Graves, Air Corps (temporary major).
 Second Lt. William Carrolton Adams, Air Corps (temporary major).
 ×Second Lt. Thomas Robert Ford, Air Corps (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Walter John Wagner, Air Corps (temporary major).
 ×Second Lt. John Lewis Zoeckler, Air Corps (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Wright Andrew Scoville, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
 ×Second Lt. William Christopher Wilkinson, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. William Bailey Crum, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
 ×Second Lt. Arden Charles Brill, Infantry (temporary major).
 Second Lt. George Washington Shivers, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Robert Clyde Stump, Field Artillery (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Jack Cecil Evans, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
 ×Second Lt. Herbert Ernest Rice, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
 Second Lt. John Fogg Twombly 3d, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
 ×Second Lt. Tom Spencer Phair, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
 ×Second Lt. Carl Paul Walter, Air Corps (temporary major).
 ×Second Lt. Troxell Olin Mason, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Jacob Franklin Mynderse, Field Artillery (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Merle Reed Preble, Infantry (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Robert Charles Hall, Field Artillery (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Harry Alexander Schendel, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Raymond Charles Durgan, Infantry (temporary major).
 ×Second Lt. Everett Albert Hansen, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
 ×Second Lt. Gerard George Wolke, Infantry (temporary captain).
 ×Second Lt. Charles Thompson Horner, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
 Second Lt. John Milton Hightower 3d, Infantry (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Hal Dale McCown, Infantry (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Hugh William McClary, Infantry (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Oscar Marion Brumfield, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
 ×Second Lt. Henry John Richter, Infantry (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Ariel Wayne Nielsen, Air Corps (temporary major).
 Second Lt. John Berkeley McPherson, Cavalry (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. Edwin O'Connor, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Emil Franklin Hawes, Infantry (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. Arthur Harold Lahlum, Infantry (temporary captain).
 ×Second Lt. Robert Condit Ingalls, Field Artillery (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Vallard Cassius Smith, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Charles Fershing Brown, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
 ×Second Lt. Peter Clark Manson, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. Arthur Claire Tillson, Infantry (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Nye Maguet Scofield, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
 ×Second Lt. Walter Greenwood, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Thomas Law Bryan, Field Artillery (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Melvin Desmond Clark, Infantry (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. Kenneth Howard Bayer, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
 Second Lt. John Marvin Kinzer, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. Lloyd Brinkley Ramsey, Infantry (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Harold Donham Higgins, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. Zim E. Lawhon, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
 ×Second Lt. William Bradford Rosson, Infantry (temporary major).
 ×Second Lt. John Edward Nitsche, Air Corps (temporary major).
 ×Second Lt. Elgin Gilbert Radcliff, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. Channing Stowell, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. John Somer Shapland, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
 ×Second Lt. Robert Harry Pell, Infantry (temporary captain).
 Second Lt. Ben Lovell Burdick, Field Artillery (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Walter Alexander Edens, Field Artillery (temporary major).
 Second Lt. Charles Vincent Wilson, Infantry (temporary major).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. William John Mische, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Claude Wiggins Cummings, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 5, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Robert Henry Lowry, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 7, 1943.
 Lt. Col. William White Southard, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 10, 1943.

×Lt. Col. Thomas Grant Tousey, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 14, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Charles Granville Souder, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 15, 1943.
 ×Lt. Col. Harrison Horton Fisher, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 15, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Laurent Lescelles La Roche, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 16, 1943.
 ×Lt. Col. Stanley Gibson Odom, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 16, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Horace Sumner Villars, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 17, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Joseph Richards Shelton, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 17, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Burgh Smith Burnet, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 17, 1943.
 ×Lt. Col. Robert Keith Simpson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 17, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Don Guernsey Hildrup, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 17, 1943.
 ×Lt. Col. Henry Wiley Grady, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Percy Elisha Duggins, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Brown Shirk McClintic, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Henry Cheesman Dooling, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Paul Henry Streit, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
 ×Lt. Col. Earle Douglass Quinell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Frank McAlpin Moece, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
 ×Lt. Col. Arthur Raymond Gaines, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Frederick Arthur Blesse, Medical Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from July 18, 1943.
 ×Lt. Col. Emory Howard Gist, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 18, 1943.
 ×Lt. Col. Samuel Augustus White, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.
 ×Lt. Col. Francis Moylan Fitts, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.
 Lt. Col. George Franklin Aycock, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Frank Smeeton Matlack, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Lewis Edwin Joel Browne, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Charles Earle Brenn, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Clean Joseph Gentzkow, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 20, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Robert Alexander Hale, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 20, 1943.
 Lt. Col. James Claude Kimbrough, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 20, 1943.
 Lt. Col. Arthur George Compton, Medical Corps, with rank from July 21, 1943.

Lt. Col. John Jay Moore, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 21, 1943.

×Lt. Col. Alfred Robert Thomas, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 23, 1943.

Lt. Col. Logan Mitchel Weaver, Medical Corps, with rank from July 24, 1943.

Lt. Col. Oral Bevely Bolibaugh, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 25, 1943.

×Lt. Col. Charles Edward Sima, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 25, 1943.

Lt. Col. Frank Walker Young, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 25, 1943.

Lt. Col. Roy Farrington Brown, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 25, 1943.

Lt. Col. Richard Turberville Arnest, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 25, 1943.

Lt. Col. Charles Levi Maxwell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 27, 1943.

×Lt. Col. William Love Starnes, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 28, 1943.

Lt. Col. Orlando Jefferson Posey, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 28, 1943.

×Lt. Col. Daniel Franklin, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 29, 1943.

Lt. Col. Haskett Lynch Conner, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 30, 1943.

Lt. Col. Arthur Howard Nylen, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 31, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Walker McCaw, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 31, 1943.

To be majors

×Capt. William Weaver Nichol, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

×Capt. Richard Paul Johnson, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

×Capt. Joseph Upton Weaver, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Capt. George Darsie McGrew, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

×Capt. Leonard Frank Wilson, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

×Capt. Major Samuel White, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Capt. Robert James Wilson, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Capt. Llewellyn Lancelot Barrow, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

×Capt. Leonard Theodore Peterson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

×Capt. George Prazak, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Capt. Roger Hubbard Allbee, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Capt. Urho Robert Merikangas, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

Capt. John Bernard Herman, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

To be captains

First Lt. William Grelle Schmitz, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Bronko Peter Lelich, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

×First Lt. Fred Albert Heimstra, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. William Harris Curry, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Thomas Henry Crouch, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Edward Philip Drescher, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Max Wendell Carver, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Richard E. Fraser, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Willard Ferguson Angen, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. John Roscoe Grunwell, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Jack Bollerud, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Jack Thomas Rush, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Sanford Williams French 3d, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Hilbert Adolph Peter Leininger, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. John Van Eman Berger, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Jack Leslie Doughtie, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Hugh Beauregard Disharoon, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Robert Morris Hardaway 3d, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Joe Dulaney Schutz, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. N. Robert Drummond, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Edward Norton Schwartz, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 5, 1943.

First Lt. Frank Henry Thone, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 8, 1943.

First Lt. Irl Richard Long, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Spencer Amos O'Brian, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Raleigh Howard Lackay, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Walter Henrik Moursund, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 22, 1943.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Harold Emerson Albaugh, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Harry Edwin Smalley, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

×Lt. Col. William Dale White, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Neal Anthony Harper, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

×Lt. Col. Earle Jefferson McClung, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Earl Lee Hering, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Leroy Poston Hartley, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Edward Crawford Alley, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Lynn Harold Tingay, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Marhl Hector Welch, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

Lt. Col. Daniel Bratton, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 25, 1943.

Lt. Col. Thomas Luther Spoon, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 25, 1943.

To be captains

First Lt. John Robert McEvoy, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Andrew Bainter Anderson, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Raymond Joseph Talbot, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. James Maxwell Murphy, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Robert Lincoln Coombs, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Richard Durham Darby, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 15, 1943.

First Lt. Frederick Robert Krug, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 15, 1943.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Stanley Clifford Smock, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 16, 1943.

Lt. Col. Burlin Chase Bridges, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.

Lt. Col. James Earl Noonan, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 23, 1943.

×Lt. Col. Josiah Wistar Worthington, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 27, 1943.

×Lt. Col. Fred Chester Waters, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 30, 1943.

Lt. Col. Harry Edward Van Tuyl, Veterinary Corps, with rank from July 31, 1943.

To be major

×Capt. George Townley Price, Veterinary Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 19, 1943.

CHAPLAINS

To be majors

Chaplain (Capt.) Peter Christian Schroder, United States Army (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 21, 1943.

Chaplain (Capt.) John Henry August Borleis, United States Army (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 22, 1943.

Chaplain (Capt.) Hudson Bissell Phillips, United States Army (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 23, 1943.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

To be captains

First Lt. Carrol Conrad Barrick, Medical Administrative Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 13, 1943.

First Lt. Thomas Raymond Jones, Medical Administrative Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 13, 1943.

First Lt. Cornelius John Curran, Medical Administrative Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 13, 1943.

First Lt. Gerard Adrien Belanger, Medical Administrative Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 13, 1943.
 ×First Lt. Guy Wycoff Harlow, Medical Administrative Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 13, 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, June 29 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

James B. M. McNally to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

Joseph T. Votava to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska.

Horace Frierson to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

George E. Proudfit to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska.

Reuben Gosnell to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION APPOINTMENTS

Ike P. Taylor, of Alaska, to be area director for Alaska at \$7,000 per annum, in the Juneau office.

Joseph H. Braunagel, of Illinois, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Peoria area office.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be Chief Signal Officer, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance

Harry Clyde Ingles

To be second lieutenant, Corps of Engineers
 Dawson Hope Mullen, Jr.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Frederic J. Hughes, Jr.

Vince Moseley

Adolph Benedict Schneider, Jr.

Freeman Irby Stephens

Bertram Allen Weeks

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps

Albert Rhoades Buckelew

To be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps

Alpheus Heise Seeley

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Merr L. Abbott, Sheridan.

IOWA

LaVaun B. Raymond, Garrison.

OHIO

Lorand T. Lewis, Apco.

Durbin W. Gerber, Dover.

Charles A. Hart, Minerva.

Harry B. Croner, Piqua.

Thomas G. Williams, Vermillion.

PUERTO RICO

Mary Peet de Velazquez, Humacao.

TENNESSEE

Regie H. Ray, Ducktown.

LeRoy J. Eldredge, Hixson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, for the constancy of Thy care, for the countless revelations of Thy presence, and for Thy manifold mercies, accept our grateful praise. Whatever may be our trial, give us courage to stand without compromise and grace to rise superior to censure and self-interest. Make our feet swift to run and our hands eager to work and the words of our Saviour will be so woven in our affections that we shall hallow them forever.

O Lamp Eternal, radiate from the heights of Thy holy hill; O Light that falls from the upper world, shine on our country; O Voice Divine, speak to all our people for only Thou art good. Grant that all things rebellious and unjust may lose their power and things ennobling and enriching may prevail throughout our land. We bless Thee for the Master whose love for humanity encircled Him with invisible power; beneath His blessed feet it broke forth amid confusion and vexed minds; it put on immortality; it never faileth. Dear Lord, unfold in us the glories of love rising above jealousies and contentions which plucks the sting of sin and inspires love for love and hate for hate and makes alive forevermore. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments numbered 87, 88, 92, 93, and 99 to said bill, disagreed to by the House, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. McNARY to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 650. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 647) entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HATCH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WALLGREN, Mr. HOLMAN, and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the com-

mittee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2513) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 32, and 72 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2397) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 10 to the foregoing bill.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2865) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STEAGALL, SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, WOLCOTT, GIFFORD, and CRAWFORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an address delivered by Joe G. Montague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therein an article appearing in the Columbia magazine entitled "Listen, Son."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial from the McKeesport Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter from Ralph B. Starkey, chairman of the legislative committee of the Cooperative Marketing Association of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial from the Coshocton Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a recent address by the Judge Advocate General of the Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on the subject of food subsidies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE DIMINISHING SUPPLY OF CRUDE OIL IS CRITICAL

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House today. I ask unanimous consent that such order be canceled and that I may be permitted to address the House tomorrow in lieu thereof following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the depletion of crude-oil reserves in this country has reached a most serious stage. It is due largely to the increased demand on the part of the Government and to the low ceiling price on crude oil. Just recently representatives of the armed forces testifying before a Senate committee said that there is an impending shortage of oil in this country. It is certain that the armed forces use more than 200,000 barrels of gasoline per day. Before the end of the year the amount will probably be doubled. It is well to observe that the Government uses about one-fourth of our oil supply. This does not include the tremendous amount used by the war industries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that the price of crude oil is so low, compared with the cost of produc-

tion, that there is not much inducement to make new discoveries for additional production. The production of crude oil last year was about 50 percent of that of the year before. It is about the same this year. Crude oil is about 60 percent of parity. It is just as low as it was 5 to 10 years ago. The increase of 50 cents per barrel would stimulate production and increase the price of gasoline only about 2 cents or 3 cents per gallon. But the most important thing, however, is the fact that at present the supply is at a dangerously low ebb and that little is being done. The situation can be corrected to some extent at least if done right away by stimulating new production by increasing the price of crude oil. It is imperative that we have a sufficient supply to take care of the demands of our planes, our tanks, and our ships. The Government does not put a price ceiling below cost on its ammunition or its guns or planes or ships. Such ceilings would restrict production. There can be no reason for restricting the production of oil by placing a ceiling below cost. It is neither reasonable nor right that a government should strangle by price restriction the production of a national resource so necessary to the prosecution of the war. It is time, I say, for those in authority and in high places to take a practical, realistic attitude toward this important problem before we have another situation of "too little and too late."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therein a short editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press entitled "Let's Get Down to Earth."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CADETS, MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 3026) relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein a certain newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter received from a soldier

serving in the armed forces in reference to strikes back home.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter written by Mr. Goss, master of the National Grange.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and to include therein a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a letter from the O. P. A. I also ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests of the gentleman are granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an address by Raymond Gram Swing.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

O. P. A. AND THE FOOD PROGRAM

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. McGEHEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include certain newspaper and radio comments and resolutions of press associations concerning the Office of War Information. The cost, I am informed by the Government Printing Office, will be \$270.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE MARVIN JONES

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a former Member of this

House who upon yesterday was appointed War Food Administrator—one of the most difficult and important jobs existing on the home front, and the conduct of which will affect our successful prosecution of the war all over the world.

I refer to Hon. Marvin Jones, who for 24 years served the district I now represent with honor and distinction not only to himself and his district but to the Nation.

Marvin Jones knows and is a friend to the man who follows the plow. He prefers to deal with facts rather than theories. He is a man of practical experience who received his early training on the farm; he knows and loves and understands the soil; and as one who served as chairman of the great Agriculture Committee of the House for 8 years, he is eminently qualified for the position to which he has been promoted. I know of no man in the entire country who has served with such marked distinction in the legislative, judicial, and administrative branches of the Government and who is better fitted for the place.

Drafted for the job as he was, Marvin will answer the call with every resource he possesses. He will meet with red tape and divided authority. He will deal with many people who still put themselves and their own interests above the welfare of the country. He will not be able to satisfy all of us, but I have every confidence he will get the job done.

It is always gratifying to see a former Member of this body—one who understands our problems—receive recognition, and I feel confident that the many friends which Marvin Jones has on both sides of the aisle in both Houses of the Congress will wish him well in the successful discharge of the heavy duties incumbent upon him.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to learn that Chester Davis has resigned. I believe, however, no better man could have been selected from any area to succeed him than Marvin Jones. I know of no one who understands the food problem any better than the man who is now placed in charge of the War Food Administration. I believe the President should be commended upon his selection; I am sure the people in general throughout the United States will view his work with favor; and I believe if he is given full power that he will carry out an effective war food program.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I feel regret over the retirement of Chester Davis, and my feelings with reference to the appointment of my long-time friend, Marvin Jones, are not wholly divested of

that sentiment because of my affection and high regard for Mr. Jones.

The office which he is undertaking to fill at the present moment is one which has been fraught with terrible confusion and fracas right from the beginning. I have known Marvin Jones, Mr. Speaker, since the year when you, and he, and I first entered the University of Texas.

Marvin Jones through the years has grown, as inevitably he would, due to amazing qualities of manhood, personality, intelligence, patriotism, well-directed and earnest effort. I voice the hope, Mr. Speaker, in congratulating the Nation on the appointment of one who has proved himself an able servant, one who has a wealth of experience as background, that that experience and the judgment which he has developed through the years will be given some opportunity to express itself and not be too hindered, too harassed, or too entangled by red tape and attendant confusion between various agencies of government. I hope, Mr. Speaker, for the country and for Marvin Jones, that he will be given an opportunity to do the kind of job I know he is capable of doing.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to pass any encomiums on Marvin Jones, although I have known him longer than any man in this House. He and I were reared in the same community in Cooke County, Tex. My father was his father's family physician. The men in this House who served with him for many years know his high character, his outstanding ability, and his knowledge of the problems of agriculture and food. Speaking for myself and also as chairman of the Texas delegation, I am sure I voice the sentiment of that delegation and through them the sentiment of all the people of Texas in saying that we have the utmost confidence in Marvin Jones and feel sure he will perform the duties of his new assignment with fidelity and efficiency.

He did not seek this job. He already had a lifetime job on one of the highest courts in the land. He was drafted and accepted it as a matter of patriotic duty. I feel in this critical hour when harmony, cooperation and teamwork are so much needed he will receive the hearty support and cooperation of all the Members of this House without regard to party affiliation. We are in a dangerous war that calls for the best in all of us. I know Judge Jones so intimately that I can assure you he has none of the dictator about him. His one big thought now is his country and the winning of the war. He believes in representative government and will want to carry out the will of Congress. Our duty is to determine policy and then give him the necessary legislation with authority to act. We can then forget the mistakes and differences of the past few weeks and solve the complex problem that is

causing our people so much worry. Marvin Jones will do his duty and prove a great Food Administrator if we will but do our duty. Let us give him our wholehearted support.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an address I delivered before the Mississippi Valley Association at St. Louis, Mo., on Monday, June 28, entitled "Floods in War and in Peace."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COOLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein two editorials, one from the Rochester Times-Union and the other from the Rochester Catholic Courier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein an editorial by Mr. Alan C. McIntosh, publisher of the Rock County Star-Herald of Luverne, Minn., entitled "A Dead Branch on the New Deal Tree."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF FOOD ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I happen to have known Marvin Jones personally for a dozen years and I have known Chester Davis for an equal period of time. But the personalities of the men are not involved. Chester Davis represents 95 percent of the agricultural thought of America against subsidies for food. Marvin Jones must represent the

President in opposition to 95 percent of the agricultural thought of America. That is the thing that is involved.

I met Chester Davis on the Committee of Twenty-two in 1926 when we came here on the McNary-Haugen bill, a bill that did not ask 1 cent of subsidy from the Government. Chester Davis is a man who has been grounded in the school of thought involved in the McNary-Haugen bill and it is therefore easy to see that he is against subsidies for food. Jones is committed to follow the repudiated policy.

THE HANDLING OF THE FOOD SITUATION

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the handling of the food situation is by far the greatest of all New Deal follies, fantasies, fallacies, and failures. The question is whether there will be enough food for the American people this next winter.

I want to read a few lines from an editorial in the Washington News of today which gives the reasons why Chester Davis resigned. I have a high personal regard for Marvin Jones and wish him well. He must be a very courageous individual to accept the appointment as War Food Administrator under such chaotic conditions which are getting worse daily.

ANOTHER FOOD ADMINISTRATOR

Chester Davis quit his job as War Food Administrator for two good and sufficient reasons:

1. He found "that I have assumed public responsibility while the authority, not only over broad food policy but day-to-day actions, is being exercised elsewhere."

2. He could not advocate and defend the administration policy of roll-back price subsidies because "I do not believe such subsidies will be effective in controlling inflation unless they are accompanied here, as they are in England, by current tax and savings programs that drain off excess buying power, and by tight control and management of the food supply. We do not have in this country anything approaching these conditions."

Convinced that in the circumstances he could not succeed, Mr. Davis did the right thing in resigning, and in stating clearly the reasons which impelled him to that decision.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a telegram I have received from the Simmons-Boardman Publishing Corporation and my answer thereto, also a telegram I have received from the American Farm Bureau Federation and my answer thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein the military order and statement concerning the naming of the Alaska Military Highway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the delegate from Alaska? There was no objection.

PAY OF MEN IN OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago I introduced and secured the adoption of an amendment raising the base pay of the men in our armed forces to \$50 a month.

Some Members of Congress opposed that amendment and some of them have been saying that the raise was not justified, that we are paying those men too much and they are wasting their money.

I have taken occasion to make some investigations, and I find that, according to ability, the men in our armed forces are buying more Government bonds than any other class of people in America.

Not only that, but they have a great many expenses to bear that they could not meet if it had not been for that raise. They are not wasting their money, but, as I said, are doing more to support our war efforts in proportion to their incomes than any other class of people we have.

Remember they are not striking or threatening to strike, and they are not paid in proportion to those people who are striking and slowing down our war industries. They are giving their all to win this war. I have no apology for making the fight to give them this raise which they so richly deserve. When the war is over, it is my hope that we extend their pay at least 6 months or a year until they can get back into civilian life, find employment, and adjust themselves to post-war conditions.

Mr. FISH. Why does not the gentleman propose an increase of 20 to 30 percent?

Mr. RANKIN. That would suit me all right; but that measure is not before the House. It may come later. I, for one, am in favor of adequate pay for the men in our armed forces, and for that reason I introduced and fought through the amendment to raise their base pay to \$50 a month.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

CHESTER DAVIS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. Gross addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MARVIN JONES

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to say to my colleagues that I think practically all of us are acquainted with Marvin Jones. I never met Mr. Davis and never saw him but once or twice. I do know that the people of this country have a very very high regard for Mr. Davis. Regardless of many of the sins of the New Deal agricultural program, which Mr. Jones has been a party to, I hope he will not follow such a course during wartime. I think in fairness to Mr. Jones and in fairness to the war effort we should start from scratch. I reserve the right personally to criticize Mr. Jones in case he does not follow the right kind of a program from here on. He cannot now continue to be a part of an agricultural program that caters to a few so-called basic crops that represent but 25 percent of the national farm income. I do not even want to mention to him the fact that he has been one of the leaders of an agricultural program that gives 6,400 farmers in the great State of Texas a subsidy of \$12,000,000 a year, which is more than the farmers in 35 other States obtain. I do not want to mention a lot of unpleasant things in connection with the unfair and unjust New Deal agricultural program. I think we should start out with Mr. Jones as Food Administrator at this time and try to help produce the food that is necessary to win this war, and do it by quitting talk about price and instead getting into high gear in production. If we do not do that, we shall not have anything to eat. We spend plenty of time talking about appropriations for food production, but the O. P. A. does not let the canners preserve this food after it is produced. I hope Mr. Jones can measure up to his responsibilities.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AGAINST WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1026) to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. McGEHEE. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. It passed the Senate and was referred to the House Committee on Claims, was unanimously reported by that committee, and is now on the calendar.

The bill was introduced at the suggestion of the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson. Its purport is to permit the War Department to settle claims for up to

\$1,000 during the period of the war; the limitation now being \$500, as is now provided by statute.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I am wondering what the effect of that will be in relation to a paragraph that is in the Army appropriation bill now pending in the Senate, unless action was finally completed yesterday, which provides authority for the War Department to settle claims for damages to personal property not exceeding \$500.

Mr. McGEHEE. I am not familiar with the provisions of the bill pending in the Senate, but I do know that there are several acts of Congress which conflict in some respect and do not give the War Department the proper authority to settle claims up to \$500. This bill consolidates them into one and makes it easier for settlements to be made, and increases the amount they can settle for during the period of the war to \$1,000.

Mr. CASE. I certainly am not opposed to the War Department's having authority to settle these small claims without requiring special legislation on each one, but in view of the fact that section is a new one in the appropriation bill and will have some bearing upon the use of money appropriated for the coming fiscal year, it would be well to examine the language of the appropriation bill and, before this bill is acted upon in the Senate, have appropriate language placed in it to avoid any possible conflict.

Mr. McGEHEE. May I say to the gentleman, as I stated before, I am not familiar with the provision of the amendment offered in the Senate on the appropriation bill, but I take it that the War Department making this recommendation and following the committees in each branch of the Congress in the passage of appropriation bills and other bills affecting it would certainly call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this legislation is pending, which would take care of the situation as they desire it. I stated to the Members that during the period of the war this permits the War Department to settle claims up to \$1,000. I might say further this will relieve your Claims Committee in both the Senate and the House of a great deal of work. It will certainly lessen the expense of settling claims, because we are all familiar with what it costs to put a bill through the two branches of Congress. I think it should be passed. It is concurred in by the entire membership of the Claims Committee.

Mr. MICHENER. This bill does not take away any right from the claimant?

Mr. McGEHEE. No; no.

Mr. MICHENER. But it simply confers the right on the Department to adjust claims up to a given amount?

Mr. McGEHEE. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. But if the claimant does not want to accept the amount offered he can then present his claim just the same as he does now?

Mr. McGEHEE. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In addition, if the Department acts adversely, the claimant can file his bill in Congress?

Mr. McGEHEE. He can file his bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the Department acted adversely within the amount they could act upon, then the claimant still has the right to come to Congress?

Mr. McGEHEE. That is right.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The question I raised was merely to be sure that that paragraph in the appropriation bill does not act as a limitation upon what you propose to do here.

Mr. MICHENER. The last law enacted dealing with a specific matter prevails. If the bill to which the gentleman now refers fixes the amount at \$1,000 and then later in the week an appropriation bill fixes the amount at \$500, there is no question but what the last law enacted will prevail.

Mr. McGEHEE. That is true. I might answer the gentleman further by saying, since he has called this proviso to my attention, and on account of the insistence by the War Department on the passage of this bill, having called me two or three times yesterday, I shall be glad to go to the Senate committee and inform them of the passage of the act with this proviso, with the view of eliminating the proviso in the appropriation bill.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. I am wondering about the burden of proof and the degree of evidence required before the War Department will be permitted to approve a claim. Does the bill tend to make the Government responsible?

Mr. McGEHEE. It places no restrictions whatever. It is left entirely in the judgment of the representatives of the War Department. In the event the War Department should turn down a claim, even though it is within the amount as called for in this bill, then the aggrieved party or the injured party has a right to have this bill introduced in Congress.

Mr. NORRELL. I was thinking there should be some degree of liability before the War Department could be permitted to act favorably on a claim.

Mr. McGEHEE. In answer to the gentleman's question, I cannot visualize just how such language could be incorporated in this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War, and, subject to appeal to the Secretary of War, such other officer or officers as he may designate for such purposes and under such regulations as he may prescribe, are hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle, and pay in an amount not in excess of \$500, or in time of war not

in excess of \$1,000, where accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction and final settlement, any claim against the United States arising on or after May 27, 1941, when such claim is substantiated in such manner as the Secretary of War may by regulation prescribe, for damage to or loss or destruction of property, real or personal, or for personal injury or death, caused by military personnel or civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army while acting within the scope of their employment, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the War Department or of the Army, including claims for damage to or loss or destruction, by criminal acts, of registered or insured mail while in the possession of the military authorities, claims for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property bailed to the Government and claims for damages to real property incident to the use and occupancy thereof, whether under a lease, express or implied, or otherwise: *Provided*, That the damage to or loss or destruction of property, or the personal injury or death, shall not have been caused in whole or in part by any negligence or wrongful act on the part of the claimant, his agent, or employee. No claim shall be settled under this act unless presented in writing within 1 year after the accident or incident out of which such claim arises shall have occurred: *Provided*, That if such accident or incident occurs in time of war, or if war intervenes within 1 year after its occurrence, any claim may on good cause shown be presented within 1 year after peace is established. The amount allowed on account of personal injury or death shall be limited to reasonable medical, hospital, and burial expenses actually incurred, except that no payment shall be made to any claimant in reimbursement for medical or hospital services furnished at the expense of the United States nor, in the case of burial, of such portion of the expense thereof as may be otherwise paid by the United States. Any such settlement made by the Secretary of War, or his designee, under the authority of this act and such regulations as he may prescribe hereunder, shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary. The provisions of this act shall not be applicable to claims arising in foreign countries or possessions thereof which are cognizable under the provisions of the act of January 2, 1942 (55 Stat. 880; 31 U. S. C. 224d), as amended, or to claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property of military personnel or civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army, or for personal injury or death of such persons, if such damage, loss, destruction, injury, or death occurs incident to their service. The Secretary of War may report such claims as exceed \$500, or in time of war \$1,000, to Congress for its consideration.

Sec. 2. Such appropriations as may be required for the settlement of claims under the provisions of this act are hereby authorized. Appropriations available to the War Department for the settlement of claims under the provisions of other laws shall be available for the settlement of claims of the same character under the provisions of this act.

Sec. 3. That portion of section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 536), reading as follows: "*Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary of War is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine the amounts due on all claims for damages to and loss of private property when the amount of the claim does not exceed the sum of \$1,000, occasioned by heavy gun fire and target practice of troops, and for damages to vessels, wharves, and other private property, found to be due to maneuvers or other military operations for which the Government is responsible, and report the amounts so ascertained and determined to be due the claimants to Congress at each session thereof

through the Treasury Department for payment as legal claims out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. The act of December 28, 1922 (42 Stat. 1066; 34 U. S. C. 215-217), shall hereafter be inapplicable to the War Department.

SEC. 5. Section 4 of the River and Harbor Act, approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 676), as amended by the act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1015; 33 U. S. C. 564), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 6. The act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stat. 350), as amended by the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 880), and by the act of March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1436), is hereby amended by adding, after section 5, the following sections:

"SEC. 5a. Any authorization or direction in this act to the Secretary of War, and any reference herein to a decision, declaration, or other action by the Secretary of War, shall include authorization or direction to, and action by, as the case may be, such other officer or officers as he may designate for such purposes, acting under such regulations as he may prescribe. Any settlement made by the Secretary of War, or his designee, under the authority of this act, under such regulations as he may prescribe, shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provisions of law to the contrary.

"SEC. 5b. The provisions of this act shall be applicable also to civilian personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army, including such personnel and employees engaged on civil works."

SEC. 7. The act of February 13, 1933 (49 Stat. 1138; 31 U. S. C. 224a), shall hereafter be inapplicable to acts of officers, enlisted men, and employees of the Army and officers, employees, or agents of the War Department.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on next Thursday, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS, 1943

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2536), to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise, and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment", approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, and 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and medical examinations where necessary to determine eligibility for vocational rehabilitation, the nature of rehabilitation services required, or occupational limitations, in the case"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "establishing such facilities and furnishing such"; and the Senate agree to the same.

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
EDWARD J. HART,
JOHN LESINSKI,

Managers on the part of the House.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment", approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments numbered 1, 10, 12, 17, 18, 21, 23, and 25: These amendments are technical and clarifying amendments. The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 2: The House bill provided that as one of the conditions for approvability of a State plan for vocational rehabilitation such plan should provide that vocational rehabilitation under it should be available only to such classes of individuals as should be approved by the Administrator. The Senate amendment provided that vocational rehabilitation under such plan should be available only to classes of employable individuals defined by the Administrator. The House recedes.

Amendments numbered 3, 4, and 5: Under the House bill one of the requirements for approvability of a State plan for vocational

rehabilitation was that it contain such provisions as to the qualification of personnel for appointment in administering the plan as are necessary to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards. The Senate amendment numbered 3 provided that the plan should contain such provisions as to personnel in administering the plan as are necessary to the establishment and maintenance of a merit system. The Senate recedes.

Amendments numbered 6 and 7: Under the House bill one of the requirements of a State plan was that it provide for compliance with such rules, regulations, and standards with respect to expenditures upon which Federal grants are made available under section 3 (a) as the Administrator might establish. The Senate amendments required the State plan to provide such rules, regulations, and standards with respect to such expenditures as the Administrator might find reasonable and necessary. The House recedes.

Amendments numbered 8, 9, 13, and 30: These Senate amendments provided for including within the scope of the Act war disabled civilians certified to the State as such by the Federal Security Administrator, and for having the Federal Government pay the necessary cost of providing vocational rehabilitation for them. As defined in section 10 (b), the term "war disabled civilian" means (1) civilians (except those paid for services as civilian defense workers) disabled while serving after December 8, 1941, and prior to the termination of the war in the Aircraft Warning Service, as members of the Civilian Air Patrol, or as members of the United States Civilian Defense Corps (including registered trainees); and (2) civilians disabled while serving during a corresponding period as officers or members of the crew of a vessel owned or chartered by the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, or operated under charter from such Commission or Administration. The disability in any such case must be incurred in line of duty and not due to the civilian's own misconduct. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill. The conference agreement retains the provisions of these Senate amendments.

Amendment numbered 30 also retained the definition of the terms "vocational rehabilitation" and "rehabilitation services" which were contained in the House bill. This amendment eliminated, however, a provision which provided in effect that such terms should not be considered to require any State to provide all such services which may be necessary, and that a State plan might be limited to training, or to training and any one or more of the other vocational rehabilitation services. As a result of the conference action on this amendment, the provision of the House bill just referred to is eliminated.

Amendments numbered 11 and 14: Senate amendment numbered 11 provided, in effect, that disabled individuals might be given medical examinations where necessary to determine eligibility for vocational rehabilitation, the nature of rehabilitation services required, or their occupational limitations. The language of the House bill which was stricken by Senate amendment numbered 14 would have limited such medical examinations to disabled individuals who were found to require financial assistance. The conference agreement retains and clarifies Senate amendment numbered 11 and the House recedes from its disagreement on Senate amendment numbered 14.

Amendment numbered 15: This amendment provided for including in the rehabilitation services furnished to needy disabled individuals transportation, occupational licenses, and customary occupational tools and equipment. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 16: This amendment provides that the conditions prescribed by the Administrator with respect to increased amounts payable to any State prior to July 1, 1945, which he finds to have substantially exhausted its funds, should be contained in "general" regulations. The House recedes.

Amendments numbered 19 and 20: Under section 7 (a) (1) of the House bill the Federal Security Administrator was authorized to utilize and enlarge facilities of appropriate units of the Federal Security Agency and to enter into agreements and cooperative work arrangements with public agencies and private persons, agencies, and institutions for services and use of facilities and to compensate them therefor. These amendments have the effect of limiting this authority in connection with vocational rehabilitation to disabled persons actually residing in the District of Columbia. The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 22: Among the powers granted to the Administrator by section 7 of the House bill was the authority to contract with other agencies, including foreign agencies for the making of studies, investigations, and reports relating to handicapped individuals. This amendment eliminated that authority. The House recedes.

Amendments numbered 24 and 26: Section 7 of the House bill also authorized the Administrator to conduct appropriate courses of instruction for personnel or detail them to such courses of not more than six weeks duration conducted by others and to provide the personnel so detailed with necessary materials, subsistence, and other expenses. These amendments limited the exercise of this authority to July 1, 1945. The House recedes.

Amendments numbered 27, 28, and 29: Under the House bill the Administrator was authorized to promulgate such regulations as he found necessary or expedient in carrying out the purposes of the Act. These amendments limit the authority of the Administrator to making such rules and regulations governing the administration of the Act as he finds necessary in carrying out its purposes. The House recedes.

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
EDWARD J. HART,
JOHN LESINSKI,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2536) generally referred to as the rehabilitation bill. This bill was passed by the House a few days ago and went to the Senate. There were 30 amendments added in the Senate. I think with the possible exception of 2 or 3 of those amendments, they definitely improve the bill.

The conferees on the part of the House met with the conferees of the Senate. Of course, as usual, there was a little giving and taking. The only matter in the bill now in controversy, or which was in controversy at the time of the conference between the House and the Senate was amendment numbered 30, which added the civil air patrol, the merchant marine, and some of the other activities. Glancing at the report you will find that most of the amendments, practically all of the amendments, are clarifying amendments. It is simply the changing of one or two words. For instance, in line 22 on page 2 the word

"persons" is changed to "individuals." In amendment No. 2, on page 3, it changes the language from "such classes of individuals as shall be approved" to "classes of employable individuals defined by the Administrator."

These amendments, I think in the main, improve the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This bill left the rehabilitation of veterans in the hands of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; as I just told the House, we do not have any service-connected veterans in here; but, of course, the service is open to all veterans, and we do not have anything in here about the T. V. A.

Mr. RANKIN. And you do not have anything in here about the R. E. A.

Mr. BARDEN. Nothing about the R. E. A.

Mr. RANKIN. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman explain what category is the C. A. P. put in? Are they in the Office of Civilian Defense? They are not in the armed branch of the service.

Mr. BARDEN. No; I understand that they are not in the armed branch.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the status of the C. A. P. now? They are in uniform, are they not?

Mr. BARDEN. I think not. I could not answer the gentleman definitely concerning that inquiry.

Mr. STEFAN. We are dealing with them in this bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I would like to know under what jurisdiction the C. A. P. comes, whether they are in the civilian defense or not.

Mr. BARDEN. I could not say whether they are under civilian defense, but I know that they are under the supervision of the Government and are performing patrol service overseas for the Government and their discipline is regulated by the Government.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman understands I do not want to be facetious.

Mr. BARDEN. I understand; that is just one of the things that I am thinking about myself.

Mr. STEFAN. Are they being put under the jurisdiction of Mr. Landis, of the United States civilian defense organization; does the gentleman know that?

Mr. BARDEN. I am sorry I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I thought I knew almost everything about this bill, but that is one definition I cannot give the gentleman.

Just in that connection, however, I want to say this, that the amendment which places the Aircraft Warning Service, the Civil Air Patrol, the merchant marine, and some others referred to,

which are kindred services, has this provision in it:

Any civilian (except a person who is paid by the United States or any department or agency or instrumentality thereof for services as a civilian defense worker)—

Now, those who are on patrol are excepted. These men are not on the Government pay roll, but volunteer their services; they get no pay for it. And as to the merchant marine, the men who now carry the supplies across the seas and serve on patrol when such conditions are met, and this by all means the most important:

But no individual shall be considered to be a war-disabled civilian unless he is disabled as a result of disease or injuries or aggravation of preexisting disease or injury incurred in the line of duty during such period and not due to his own misconduct.

That to me is very clear and I think it is just. We have passed a bill which takes care of the Federal expenses of the service-connected veterans and in effect these men must be service-connected; they must have been injured in line of duty while in the performance of their duty, and then if they apply for rehabilitation service the cost of that particular kind is paid wholly by the Federal Government. In other words, the service provided for in this bill is on a 50-50 matching basis and there are many reasons why this should be done.

One is that all the records pertaining to these men are in the departments here in Washington; they are the ones that can determine whether or not these men were injured in line of duty, and if they were they are certified to the States and then they are given the rehabilitation training that they request.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman has just made the statement that all of the records are kept in Washington covering these workers, members of the Office of Civilian Defense, Aircraft Patrol, and others. Now let us assume that at the end of 3 or 4 years a case arises where rehabilitation is necessary. I think the gentleman is making an argument against his amendment, because they will have to go through the records for the use of the people who are out in the States, who may be 2,000 miles from here, or those out there will have to come to Washington.

Mr. BARDEN. I am sorry; I am afraid the gentleman has misunderstood my remarks. While the records remain here, they are certified from Washington; the same records are here that are provided for the certification of veterans.

The veteran enlists in your State or mine and goes into service. He may serve in the State, but the records are here in the Veterans' Administration and we very wisely provided in the legislation we passed that these veterans should be certified to the State by the Veterans' Administration. This will be negligible unless we have some air raids or an invasion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

If we have an air raid or a bombing raid it will very likely strike in some concentrated area. If it were to strike New York City and a tremendous rehabilitation load were to grow out of it, I think it would be hardly fair to harness all of that expense on the State of New York. I think that these men—and I cannot see it any other way—I think that these men who carry the tankers through the Atlantic and the Pacific and pilot the supplies to the soldiers, these men who pilot the Civil Air Patrol planes hunting submarines, those who man the volunteer services without pay are just as much service-connected and just as closely connected to the war as you could possibly make them. What is the difference if a man is on an oil tanker carrying oil to north Africa and that ship is shot out from under him and he is blinded by the fire, as I have seen some of them—what is the difference in the status of that man as far as the Government's responsibility to rehabilitate him is concerned and the fellow who is blinded putting the oil in the tank? I cannot see any distinction myself.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. As a matter of fact, is there not a substantial difference in the compensation paid? Are not these men on the tankers paid substantial bonuses for every trip in the war zone?

Mr. BARDEN. I am sorry that I cannot give the gentleman any definite information on that, but I am not concerned with whether a man gets 50 cents or \$50.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think it makes a great deal of difference.

Mr. BARDEN. We are concerned, however, with a rehabilitation program. This is no pension bill. We have provided rehabilitation for the disabled of this country under this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. A pension bill will follow, though.

Mr. BARDEN. I know; we are not concerned with that here.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It will come eventually.

Mr. BARDEN. But I want to say this, I am not yet mad with the boys who are carrying the supplies across the seas, not yet.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. As I understand the gentleman's position now he is placing all these classes and groups to which he refers in exactly the same category as the disabled war veterans back from the battle fronts.

Mr. BARDEN. No; the gentleman did not understand me to say that.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think the gentleman made himself very clear.

Mr. BARDEN. I said that as far as the Government's responsibility for rehabilitation is concerned, I can see absolutely no difference.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I wanted to be clear about it.

Mr. BARDEN. Why should New York State, just because a man left the country from the port of New York, be considered his domicile should he be injured in mid-Atlantic and New York have to pay 50 percent of the rehabilitation cost when it is the burden of the Federal Government because of the nature of the war service?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If I correctly understood the amendment which the gentleman is discussing the only difference is that the Federal Government will pay all of the costs of rehabilitating these people referred to, whereas if the amendment were not in the bill the States would be required to pay half.

Mr. BARDEN. That is exactly the difference. That provision was not in the bill when it went to the Senate. It was in the bill when the bill came to the House committee but the committee eliminated it on a vote of 8 to 6. The Senate restored the provision. There was another amendment in which more Members of the House were concerned than this and we retained every part of that and the Senate receded. We conferees receded on this. Two of the conferees did not sign the report but no minority views were filed. Eight of the ten conferees did sign the report and I believe that the addition to the bill, if anything, improves it. Certainly it does not injure the bill and I sincerely hope the House will adopt the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I think it is an improvement to the bill. I do not know of any more hazardous occupation outside the front-line trenches than that of the men who take these tankers across the submarine-infested oceans and who carry supplies to our soldiers. Those who enlist in this service come from all over the country, but the records, as I understand it, are kept in these Government agencies in Washington; that is, in the Government agencies. I think it is a very, very wise provision myself.

Mr. HART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HART. Before the gentleman leaves the floor, I hope he will explain to the House what was done on the part of the Senate conferees in yielding when the House conferees agreed to accept this amendment. As the gentleman stated at the outset of his remarks, it was

a give-and-take proposition, and, while the House conferees accepted amendment 30, it was not until the Senate had agreed to accept a very important concession that the conferees of the House demanded. I hope the gentleman will elucidate on that.

Mr. BARDEN. That is true, and I will touch on that in a minute.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Regarding amendments numbered 8, 9, 13, and 30, which we discussed a little while ago and which refers to the Civilian Air Patrol, may I inform my colleague that since we were talking about it I spoke to Mr. Landis, of the Civilian Defense organization, and he tells me that the C. A. P. has been taken away from the Civilian Defense and has now been taken over entirely by the War Department. They are uniformed, they are paid a per diem and also a mileage. The reference in these amendments is merely for the rehabilitation of the C. A. P., is that correct?

Mr. BARDEN. That is all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. In answer to the statement made by the gentleman from New Jersey as to the Senate conferees yielding, I think the House should understand that we yielded on 26 of these amendments while the Senate only yielded on 2 or 3.

Mr. BARDEN. May I ask the gentleman if in his honest, conscientious opinion he does not think that at least 25 of the 26 amendments improve the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. I think a great many of them do.

Mr. BARDEN. You are not giving away much when you are helping yourself, then.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. In view of what the gentleman from Nebraska just reported, is it not true then that the Civil Air Patrol is now taken out from the provisions of this bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Certainly not.

Mr. CHENOWETH. They receive a per diem. If they receive money from the Government they cannot come under this bill. That takes them from under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not think so, and the legal draftsmen did not intend to take them out.

Mr. CHENOWETH. It is a question what the bill says. It is in there.

Mr. BARDEN. If it is, it would be too bad. If that did happen, it would be in line with the gentleman's views.

Mr. CHENOWETH. They are no longer in the bill, if that statement is true.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think the gentleman misunderstood the purpose of my question awhile ago. I am trying to ascertain whether these men on tankers are not civilian employees covered by workmen's compensation on the part of their employer. Is not that employer then responsible for any rehabilitation? They paid a premium for that purpose; it is part of their compensation, and I do not think the Federal Government ought to come in and give vocational training to the employees of the Standard Oil Co. or any other oil company.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman, he has probably missed the purpose of this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is what I want to get straight.

Mr. BARDEN. The purpose of this bill is to rehabilitate the employees of the Standard Oil Co., the railroad companies, the small companies, and the individuals.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. But they paid compensation insurance for that.

Mr. BARDEN. We make no distinction in the body of the bill with reference to that. So far as the folks that you are referring to are concerned, this is about one of the finest pieces of labor legislation that has ever passed through this House. This is one piece of legislation that every labor organization and every laboring man is a thousand percent for, anyway you figure it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Does the gentleman want the Federal Government to pay for the vocational training of an employee who has been covered by his employer for that purpose and has paid a premium?

Mr. BARDEN. When they come in and qualify under this bill, if they are blind then the Government pays them a blind compensation, and as soon as you can rehabilitate them they get off the Federal pay roll.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. But the gentleman realizes the insurance company insured the Standard Oil Co.

Mr. BARDEN. We are not dealing with the insurance company.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. You will be.

Mr. BARDEN. No; we are not dealing with the insurance company.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The Standard Oil Co. pays a premium to rehabilitate any injured employee.

Mr. BARDEN. Here is what the amendment says:

Any civilian disabled while serving at any time after December 8, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war as an officer or a member of the crew of the vessel owned or chartered by the Marine Commission or the War Shipping Administration or operated under charter from such Commission or Administration.

That does not sound like the Standard Oil Co.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is all Standard Oil Co.

Mr. BARDEN. No.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. What did the conferees do with reference to the Taft amendment limiting rehabilitation projects to public institutions?

Mr. BARDEN. What is that?

Mr. COLE of New York. Is there anything in the conference report that limits the rehabilitation enterprises or projects to only public institutions?

Mr. BARDEN. No; there is nothing like that in it. Senator Taft was a member of the conferees and heartily approved the result of this conference.

Mr. COLE of New York. An amendment was put on this bill limiting places where persons could be rehabilitated to public institutions only.

Mr. BARDEN. No, no. I think every member of the conference would have objected to that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, it was with some regret that I found myself unable to surrender my convictions and agree to the conference report in its entirety. I call to the attention of the House the fact that this bill was reported from our Committee on Education unanimously and passed by the House unanimously. Amendment No. 30 was inserted by the Senate. My objection is to amendment No. 30, which puts back into this bill after it was stricken out by our committee certain classes of people who will come under 100-percent Federal rehabilitation. This bill changes the existing law in one respect. It provides for 100-percent administrative cost by the Federal Government. To that extent the classes of people who are included in this bill, if this amendment remains will be under the influence of the Federal Government.

The classes designated in the bill by the Senate as "war disabled civilians" and to which I object, are the Aircraft Warning Service, members of the Civil Air Patrol, members of the United States Citizens Defense Corps, registered trainees for protective services, and those who may be employed by the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, or operating under charter from such commission or administration.

Before proceeding to the particular amendment, I wish to call attention to one thing that in my opinion was inadvertently overlooked in our conference yesterday with the Senate. In amendment 30 the Senate struck out this language:

Such terms shall not, however, be considered to require any State to provide all such services which may be necessary, but a State plan may be limited to training, or to training and any one or more of the other vocational rehabilitation services.

This provision in some degree safeguarded the States. They need or they need not adopt the entire program. That provision was taken out. Therefore it takes away from the State some of the safeguards we have attempted to throw around them in this bill and places in the hands of the Federal Government the right to say to a State, "You either adopt the whole program or we will not accept the plans that you submit to the Federal Security Administrator for approval."

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. In just a moment I will yield to my distinguished chairman, for I know what he is about to say. He is about to say that he conferred with the director of the rehabilitation program yesterday, who said that practically all of the States of the Union now have a full program.

Mr. BARDEN. May I correct the gentleman and say that all of them have that?

Mr. DONDERO. The entire number; I will accept the gentleman's correction. But be that as it may, nevertheless, if a State chooses to submit a plan to the Federal Security Administrator without the full content of the program, he would have a right to reject it. He would not have that right if that language had remained in the bill. To that extent I think it takes away one of the safeguards to the States.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman that, of course, no point was raised by the gentleman or anyone else about that in the conference we had with the Senate.

Mr. DONDERO. I am stating plainly that that matter was inadvertently overlooked.

Mr. BARDEN. In view of the fact that every State in the Union with a rehabilitation program today, which is 46 out of the 48, has the entire program of its own volition, where would we be with a kind of a half-baked program in some States, with the Veterans' Administration having authority to send a disabled veteran there to be rehabilitated? Say Michigan had only a part of the program and veterans from Michigan were certified there by the Veterans' Administration to be trained. Michigan would have to say, "We do not have anything. We cannot do that because we do not have the program." Then Michigan veterans would have to be sent somewhere else.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from North Carolina knows that we have been operating a rehabilitation program in this country for 23 years.

Mr. BARDEN. That is right.

Mr. DONDERO. Not under this bill but under the basic law. We have never had any difficulty. There has been a happy relationship between the States and the Federal Government without this legislation. So if there were anything to that proposition, it would be removed in the light of experience through the years. I look with favor upon and have supported the present Federal and State rehabilitation program.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman will admit that this bill is a vast curtailment.

of the Federal authority as it existed in the basic act. We have thrown many, many safeguards around the States that did not exist in the basic act. Is not that correct?

Mr. DONDERO. I think that is correct; and that was our purpose in framing this legislation.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I was somewhat surprised at the statement of the chairman of the committee just now that this program is in operation in 48 States.

Mr. BARDEN. No; I did not say that. I said 46 out of the 48 States, as I recall.

Mr. CHENOWETH. One of the highly controversial issues in this bill was physical restoration. The gentleman does not mean to tell this House that 46 States have a program of physical restoration and rehabilitation?

Mr. BARDEN. None of the 46 States has a physical-restoration program under the law except as it has kind of stretched it out.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman from Michigan was bringing out that under this provision they might be compelled to have it against their wish.

Mr. DONDERO. Let me say to the gentleman from North Carolina that, while physical restoration may not have been adopted in the States, four States under the basic law are now operating such a program and it is recognized on the part of the Federal administration. The language in the basic law, in my judgment, is broad enough so that it could be interpreted to include that, but we attempted in this bill to spell it out a little more distinctly.

Now let me come to the point I want to make and the reason why I could not sign the conference report. This provision in the bill, amendment No. 30, placing all of these classes of people entirely under the supervision of the Federal Security Administrator, does one thing. They can be rehabilitated in the States and the Federal Government is to pay the entire cost, if this conference report is adopted. They will pay only half if it is not adopted, and the States will pay the other half. But the thing to which I object is adding to the growing bureaucracy of the Federal Government.

This means expansion of bureaucracy in Washington. I have before me a list of 102 new agencies of this Government set up in Washington in the last 10 years, a list prepared by a gentleman in the State of Texas. I do not know how many more there are, but here is a list of 102. No one need be surprised that we have chaos and confusion in the Nation's Capital. The report recently filed by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures presents the amazing fact that in April of this year more than 3,000,000 people were in the executive branch of the Government and the monthly pay roll had mounted to the indefensible sum of more than \$552,000,000 or the staggering total of \$6,624,000,000 annually.

As evidence of the disregard of the Nation's welfare and the wanton waste

with which bureaucracy operates, let me call to the attention of the House the fact that while newspapers throughout the country have been forced to curtail the use of newsprint, our Government issued 250,000 copies of a 146-page booklet entitled "The Fleas of North America." Such was the news release given to the American people by a nationally known radio commentator. How can we justify our position in adding to the juggernaut of government—this Federal Frankenstein—and at the same time limit the newspapers of the country to the point where the public cannot obtain information while the 3,200 Government press agents issue such pamphlets which are only thrust into the wastebaskets.

In a recent poll taken among the farmers of the Nation, 89 percent expressed it as their opinion that the production of food was hindered most by too much interference from Washington.

Let me say that this kind of governmental juggernaut will not only plague the Congress, and I think it is doing so now, but it will beset and impoverish the people of the United States unless it is reduced instead of increased.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the gentleman ever tried to cut out one of these bureaus? We are holding hearings now on the Federal Coal Commission bill, to extend its life. It is perfectly amazing the number of Republicans who come and ask for an extension of this Commission.

Mr. DONDERO. Let me answer the gentleman by saying that the ship of state ought to be put in drydock, and the Congress of the United States, with the legislative tools at its command, should begin to cut away the barnacles in order that the ship of state may again ride at even keel.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is waterlogged now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. The sooner we do that the sooner the Federal Government will administer the laws of this country more efficiently and solve the problems we have before us.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is it the gentleman's understanding that under this bill an air-raid warden or watcher who might be injured while protecting his own property or that of his neighbor would come under this program?

Mr. DONDERO. He would. The gentleman from Connecticut asks the question whether or not an air-raid warden would come under this program. He would. I do not believe in setting up classes in the United States. I do not believe this class of people are any more entitled to rehabilitation—and I am for the rehabilitation program—than the man who works in a defense factory and loses a leg and is not able to rehabilitate himself. The States are doing it under

the existing program. It would also do it for an air-raid warden without the amendment in question. For that reason I think it is a mistake for the Congress of the United States to include these people and place them completely under Federal control.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is a natural step, after you recognize responsibility for the Federal Government to rehabilitate them, to turn around and pass pension laws covering the same people.

Mr. DONDERO. There is something in what the gentleman says. It is not quite so easy if it has to be done through the States.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Do these new classes of people who are brought under the provisions of this bill have to qualify from the standpoint of financial need?

Mr. DONDERO. I doubt it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Do the air-raid wardens and watchers have to qualify from the standpoint of financial need?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think the bill itself spells that out.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is not the philosophy of this bill that only those who are injured but who are in need financially and cannot take care of their needs are covered by it?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes, that should be the philosophy.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman ever considered having this under the United States Employment Agency for the disabled? There is one for the disabled veterans, you know.

Mr. DONDERO. That is done largely now through State organizations.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But would it not be a good plan to have the Federal Government have one? It would help in securing jobs for people.

Mr. DONDERO. I think it is being done through the many employment agencies in the States, with a great deal of satisfaction.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the Federal Government could help in getting Federal jobs.

Mr. DONDERO. Possibly that is true.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It seemed to me that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] was confused about this matter. This bill does not bring in new classes under the rehabilitation program. It simply provides that as to a particular class, in amendment No. 30, the Federal Government assumes all of the cost, whereas under the present program the States would pay half of it. Is that not correct?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct. That is the only difference, with one exception. That is this: that under this bill as it is drawn that class would have to be certified first by the Federal Security Administrator here in Washington.

On the other hand, if it is left to the States, they would be certified by the State vocational rehabilitation boards.

Mr. RAMSPECK. They are certified only so that the State might be relieved of half of the cost, but if they are not certified, then they can still participate, but the State would pay half of the cost.

Mr. DONDERO. The State would pay half of the cost, and the Federal Government would pay the other half, plus all the cost of administration.

I hope the conference report will be sent back for further consideration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute, to say that there is not one word in here creating a new bureau, setting up a new agency or anything kindred to what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] said. Here is the only question involved, and I think the gentleman would be frank enough to admit this. Is the Federal Government in this group to pay 50 percent or 100 percent? If they pay 50 percent the State pays 50 percent. If they pay 100 percent, then they pay 100 percent. That is all there is and there is nothing else in it. They are now entitled to the rehabilitation, under the general bill. There cannot be but one thing and that is this: Is this service connected close enough to the Federal Government and the war that it should pay 100 percent for the rehabilitation?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] 3 minutes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the controversy that has arisen here, it is not quite just the difference between 50 percent and 100 percent payment by the Federal Government, there is also the question as to whether the disabled require financial assistance. As the bill comes to us from conference, disabled individuals can qualify under the Federal-State matching program only if they need financial aid; but those war-disabled civilians under the classifications we are discussing, air wardens, civil air patrol, aircraft warning service, or the Maritime Commission, are to be provided 100-percent Federal money for their rehabilitation, regardless of their financial status, or whether they can get money for such purposes from pension, compensation, or insurance.

If the language we have in subsection 3, under amendment 13, were inserted under amendment 9, I think it would handle the problem. As the language now reads, anybody who serves and is injured as an air-raid watcher, can come in, even if he is a millionaire, and get 100 percent payment from the Government for his rehabilitation, without having to prove that he requires financial assistance with respect thereto.

I think the bill should go back to conference for revision of the two things that have been mentioned here. One is to make sure the States will not be compelled, in order to get Federal aid, to set up a complete rehabilitation program,

if they do not want to. The other is with respect to the classifications of individuals who are to get 100-percent Federal money for their rehabilitation, and whether or not they must prove they need financial assistance. The latter could be remedied by adding the one clause to subsection (1), on page 6, at the end of line 7, as we already have it in subsection (3).

After the word "civilians" strike out the semicolon and insert the following: "And found to require financial assistance with respect to vocational rehabilitation, after full consideration of the eligibility of such individual for any similar benefit by way of pension, compensation, or insurance."

I think it is bad to adopt a policy under which any citizen who volunteers for example, to serve as an air warden in his block is automatically made a Federal responsibility, regardless of his own financial status. I think most of them do not want to be getting Federal money for their patriotic service. But I believe we ought to have this safeguard, and if suggested language is made a part of the bill, it will meet most of the objections that have been mentioned by those conferees who refuse to sign the report.

I favor 100-percent Federal money for those injured in Federal war work, if they need it. But I do not think they ought to get rehabilitation at public expense, unless they actually are found to need it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. They will be entitled to rehabilitation service, but how many of them does the gentleman think will ever ask for it? There may be millionaires who are serving on oil tankers who are injured, but for all practical purposes I am wondering how many of them would ask for rehabilitation.

Mr. JUDD. I doubt that many millionaires will be serving on oil tankers; and the grounds for rehabilitation of men in the merchant marine are different from those serving in the voluntary civilian services. The former have insurance, and in addition they have higher wages; they receive up to \$600 a month to take care of such contingencies. Some groups have workmen's compensation benefits in case of injury. I think they ought not to be certified for vocational rehabilitation unless it is found that they need financial assistance in order to get it.

Surely it is strange for us to require that disabled civilians show financial need before they get 50-percent Federal aid, but do not require that war-disabled civilians show any financial need whatsoever in order to get 100-percent Federal payment for their rehabilitation services.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], I refused to sign this conference report. I think whenever a conferee is in position that

he cannot sign a conference report he should explain his position to the House. I agreed to all of the Senate amendments except 8, 9, 13, and 30.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has already made a statement as to our attitude. I think perhaps I ought to explain the history of this legislation. We have had a vocational rehabilitation law in the United States for over 23 years, the first act having been passed on June 2, 1920. This law provides vocational rehabilitation for all civilians. No groups or classes are recognized. All are treated alike, who can qualify for this training. That is what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and myself are now insisting should still be done.

However, for some reason, which I have not been able to ascertain, there is an influence seeking to place certain groups of civilians in the same category with disabled war veterans who are coming back from the battle fronts. These veterans receive rehabilitation training at solely Government expense. Civilians are rehabilitated by the States, with the Government contributing one-half of the cost. We believe that vocational rehabilitation is a State function, except for the disabled war veterans, and that there should be no change in the policy that has proved so successful for the past 23 years.

We are not arguing against the rehabilitation of these groups. They are entitled to it, if they are injured, and will receive this training under the present bill without the Senate amendments. We merely say that all civilians should be treated alike.

The Committee on Education had this matter up when this bill was first considered. You will recall that originally this bill also included veterans. Vigorous protests were made by veterans' organizations. It was the general sentiment that veterans should be considered separately from civilians. Subsequently, a bill was passed providing for vocational rehabilitation of disabled war veterans only. This left only civilians in the bill. Our committee then eliminated the sections creating these groups of civilians. The House passed the bill in this form.

The bill went over to the Senate where the provisions were reinserted. This is the controversy before us.

Let me call attention to the rather absurd situation in which we find ourselves today. We are called upon to provide for rehabilitation training for certain groups of civilians who may render a Federal service of one kind or another if they sustain injuries in line of duty. At the same time, to my knowledge, not one single act has been passed providing any medical or hospital care in such an event.

I submit that it is ridiculous to provide rehabilitation training for these special groups at straight Government expense, when there is no provision to even pay their doctor or hospital bills in case of accidents.

As I have mentioned before, any person in any of these classes named in the Senate amendment is eligible for this

training under the program now in effect, and which is continued by this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. An air-raid warden tomorrow night is injured in his own automobile going to his station as a result of a test black-out. He secures damages from the person who ran into his automobile; yet under this bill it would still be the responsibility of the Federal Government to pay for his rehabilitation.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is right. It sets up these civilian groups in the same category as disabled war veterans. I maintain that persons entitled to rehabilitation should be divided into only two groups. One is the veterans to whom we owe a primary obligation to rehabilitate at wholly Federal expense. The other, the civilian group, which will include air wardens and the other classes herein named. The Federal Government will contribute one-half of the expense. In this bill, we are also providing that the administrative expense shall be paid 100 percent by the Federal Government. Heretofore it has been 50 percent. Another clause in this bill would provide that if any State runs out of money the Government can advance the whole amount necessary to carry on the program. Surely we are being more than liberal with the States.

Another singular thing. Not one word of testimony was given before our committee that any State had requested that this provision be inserted. The States are willing to pay their share of this expense and are satisfied with the bill as it passed the House.

As far as the maritime group is concerned I think it would be a mistake to set them up as a separate class. Perhaps they are in a little different category, but I believe it is a mistake to establish any classification of civilians for this rehabilitation training. Everyone involved should be treated alike. All will be taken care of. The States are not asking to be relieved of this obligation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Do the hearings show the number of these particular groups who come within the provision of this bill who would be entitled to this service? The States are not asking for this?

Mr. CHENOWETH. There was no testimony that any State was asking for such a classification or that it is necessary. I do not recall a single witness who appeared before our committee in support of the proposal.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, only this morning I have talked with the gentleman from my own State who has in charge this program and with some Representatives of other States who are interested in the program in those States. They approve this conference report and they want it adopted.

I can understand the point of view of the gentleman from Michigan and some of the others here who are not satisfied with it, but did you ever see a conference report which was entirely satisfactory to both sides? By the nature of the action it is the giving and the taking between the two Houses in order that we may have a bill. If you send this conference report back the chances are 9 out of 10 that this Congress will adjourn for the summer with no legislation on this subject. This Congress is getting ready to take a recess for the summer but the States need a continuation of this program. They do not need it for the interest of the States particularly; they need it for the interest of the war effort. They are training these people to work in the shipyards and factories where they are making munitions of war, and they need it now when there is such a shortage of manpower. The physically handicapped and the disabled can be trained to fit in the program and reduce the manpower shortage. It seems to me to be a great mistake to quibble about this mere difference here as to whether the Federal Government is going to pay 100 percent of the cost or 50 percent of the cost for certain classes of people who are rendering a Federal service. Members of the Civil Air Patrol are doing the same thing that the Air Corps does in the Army and Navy, guarding our shore line. Service in the merchant marine of this country is certainly just as hazardous as any service that can be rendered in the interest of the welfare of this country. It seems to me, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to adopt this conference report and let this program go forward and let these people be trained by the Vocational Rehabilitation Service of each State. We need the services of these people. As far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to see the Federal Government pay the entire cost of these services because the services referred to are really in the interest of the war effort. If, of course, these people are not certified for 100-percent participation they will still be eligible for 50-percent participation under the general statute. It seems to me we are making a mountain out of a molehill. I think the conference report should be adopted and this act put into effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Raymond Moley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to make an explanation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the Members that the real fight in the conference committee and the thing which we cherished most was this provision which kept in the States

the right to run this program. The amendment was originally offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Your committee after considerable effort worked out that amendment to leave the control of it absolutely in the States. The Senate amended that. They wanted to put in a merit system and so forth which would have put the control back in Washington where we do not want it. We stuck solidly for this amendment and agreed to recede on amendment No. 30. We have in this bill what we most wanted and what the Senate has failed to recede from certainly is not injurious to it.

I hope the House will adopt this conference report because it needs to be in effect by July 1.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Would not the gentleman say that by insisting upon State control of this program that we have secured at least 90 percent of what we wanted?

Mr. BARDEN. Absolutely and I will say that this is the best piece of States rights legislation that has gone through the Congress since I have been here and even one who did not like the bill could not say to the contrary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DONDERO rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] rise?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask for a division of the House.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I think the motion comes too late. I do not like to make that point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion having been made to reconsider and to lay it upon the table, the Chair thinks that it is not at liberty to exercise any further option in the matter.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I will not insist on it.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Duke, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill 2714, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments, Nos. 5, 60, and 61 to said bill, dis-

agreed to by the House, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Navy.
2. Department of War.
3. National Archives.
4. Federal Security Agency.
5. Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1134. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that Mr. RADCLIFFE be appointed a conferee on the part of the Senate, vice Mr. WAGNER, resigned, to the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2869) entitled "An act to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the agency:

United States Maritime Commission.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report. The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain

amendments of the Senate and amendments of the House to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 97, 122, and 123.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the word "herein" where it occurs in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the words, "in this Act"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,123,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,349,063"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

In the first paragraph of said amendment in the proviso thereof, and after the word "projects" where the same first occurs in such proviso, insert the words "under his supervision."

At the end of the first paragraph of said amendment, following the word "funds" and before the period, insert the following: "Provided further, That during the first four months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the Administrator of the War Food Administration may, in his discretion, authorize expenditures from this appropriation at a rate in excess of one-twelfth of the total appropriation during each of such months."

In the third paragraph of said amendment after the word "elsewhere", and before the comma, insert the following: "at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made."

In the third paragraph of said amendment before the word "Provided" strike out the colon and insert a period, and strike out all of the proviso down to and including the word "made."

In the fourth paragraph of said amendment after the word "necessary" insert the following: "in the discretion of the Administrator."

At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert a new paragraph reading as follows:

"No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading 'Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation' shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the third paragraph of said amendment, in the first proviso thereof, after the word "tenancy" and before the semicolon, insert the following: "or an amount sufficient to make not more than five loans in any one State or

Territory, whichever amount is the larger"; and the House agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 87, 88, 92, 98, and 99.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. McNARY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

(Second conference report)

The managers on the part of the House at the second conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and amendments of the House to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

TOTALS, AND OTHER TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

The following amendments relate to correction of totals, technical correction of text, etc.: Nos. 19, 120, and 121.

PARITY PAYMENTS

Amendment No. 97: Strikes out the language inserted by the Senate authorizing parity payments for the crop years 1943 and 1944.

U. S. WAREHOUSE ACT

Amendment No. 116: Appropriates \$464,115 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION— LOANS

Amendment No. 122: Appropriates \$20,000,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$30,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

RURAL REHABILITATION

(Farm Security Administration)

Amendment No. 126: Retains the House provision, with amendments as indicated in the following text. The portions of the House provision which have been deleted are incorporated in the text, enclosed by brackets. New language, proposed to be added, is shown in italic type.

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the War Food Administration, \$20,000,000, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress

semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under his supervision, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds: *Provided further, That during the first 4 months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the Administrator of the War Food Administration may, in his discretion, authorize expenditures from this appropriation at a rate in excess of one-twelfth of the total appropriation during each of such months.*

In making any grant payments under this act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the Act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.*

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, who are unable to obtain credit elsewhere at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed \$60,000,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine: *[Provided, That no loan shall be made out of such funds except loans which have first been offered and refused by other lending agencies (including the Emergency Crop and Feed Division of the Farm Credit Administration, the Production Credit Associations, and private lending agencies) customarily engaged in making loans of a similar character at comparable rates for the area where such loan is proposed to be made].* The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, or cooperative farming, or the organization, promotion, or management of homestead associations, land-leasing associations, land-purchasing associations, or cooperative land purchasing for colonies of rehabilitants or tenant purchasers, except for the liquidation

as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of \$2,500; or (4) the making of loans to any cooperative association; or (5) the making of loans for the payment of dues to or the purchase of any share or stock interest in any cooperative association (except for medical, dental, or hospital services) or for any expenditure other than that deemed necessary, in the discretion of the Administrator, for the production of agricultural commodities.

The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

FARM TENANCY

Amendment No. 127: Retains the House provision, with an amendment shown in italic type in the following text:

FARM TENANCY

To enable the Secretary through the War Food Administration to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C., 1000-1006), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C., 1000-1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act, \$1,326,070.

Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), \$30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 per centum per annum and which sum shall not be used for making loans under the terms of said Act for the purchase of farms of greater value than the average farm unit of thirty acres and more in the county, parish, or locality in which such purchase may be made, which value shall be determined solely according to statistics of the farm census of 1940: *Provided, That the amount which is available to any State or Territory for making loans under such title I shall be distributed by the Secretary, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory, except that he shall not distribute to any such county or parish in excess of two times the amount which would be distributed to such county or parish were the entire amount available to the State or Territory distributed among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy, or an amount sufficient to make not more than five loans in any one State or Territory, whichever amount is the larger; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to*

the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006): *Provided, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 per centum of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: Provided further, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: Provided further, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.*

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The managers on the part of the House report the following amendments in disagreement:

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

Amendment No. 87: Strikes out the House language limiting the appropriation to payments "for compliances with soil-building practices and water conservation practices under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended" and inserts language making the appropriation available "for compliance with programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended", etc.

Amendment No. 88, incentive payments: Strikes the House provision prohibiting incentive payments.

Amendment No. 92: Strikes out the House language limiting the program to soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, and inserts language permitting a program of broader scope, giving more emphasis to the production of food by including practices not necessarily soil-building.

Federal crop insurance

Amendments Nos. 98 and 99, Federal crop insurance: Appropriates \$7,818,748, instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House, and strikes out the House language providing for liquidation of the corporation.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
W. F. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, there is no disagreement among the conferees in reference to the items in the agricultural appropriation bill which are disposed of in the conference report and so far as I know there is no objection to the conference report. Unless some Member desires to discuss the matter, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 87: Page 69, strike out lines 12 to 18, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "to remain available until June 30, 1945, for compliance with programs under the Agricultural Adjustment

Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1943 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943, inclusive."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 87. I understand that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] desires to offer a preferential motion and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House that we are getting down to the time when we are trying to recess, and that we only have three amendments in disagreement. I cannot understand just why any Member would not want to agree to my motion.

We have retained the \$100,000,000, making the total amount \$400,000,000. All the Senate amendment, which I am asking your concurrence in, does is to leave this money available through the period 1945 to be used in connection with soil conservation, tied in with production. Why would you put the \$100,000,000 in and then write in some language that might prevent using same? So I am hoping that we will have no trouble in agreeing to my motion so that the Senate amendment, which is short and definite, will be carried out in line with the purpose of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Act. That is, that it shall remain for the proper period so as to continue the program which has been running successfully for several years.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is all I want to say at this time. I cannot understand why we should not agree to this Senate amendment, which is fair. I would like to make one further statement. In a great many instances during the past months, instead of the Congress doing something definite in the interest of being helpful, what you have been doing is cutting appropriations and putting in amendments to destroy programs and various agencies. If and when some of these agencies fail, which they are going to do, then where will the responsibility lie? You have not passed any legislation and when these programs and agencies fail, the Congress will be held responsible. If we cannot give them something definite, like I proposed in my bill, H. R. 2837, giving definite power to the Food Administrator, then let us not by cutting appropriations and putting in amendments hamper various programs and what they are trying to do so that if and when they should fail, these agencies, along with the President, will not be in a position to put the blame on Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my motion will prevail.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that a feeling of fatigue has set-

led upon this deliberative body. I am just as anxious to go home as any Member of this body. I am just as anxious to find a bit of respite and relaxation from what in all modesty I can say has been a rather arduous labor on the Appropriations Committee for the last 6 months. But no matter how inclement or hot the weather in Washington, and no matter what fatigue of spirit and mind I may experience, it is not sufficiently impelling to sacrifice or to surrender the principle which I long ago espoused.

The boys in Africa are fatigued, too, and the boys in the Pacific and the boys everywhere, yet they must carry out their duty even as we must carry out our legislative responsibility.

So I find myself in disagreement with the preferential motion that was submitted by the gentleman from South Carolina, and I do so simply because it is a matter of deep conviction.

It is years now since I have been contending in the well of this House that the salvation of the American farmer is a substantial price in the open market place. That will mean a free agriculture, that will mean a free farmer, who is the backbone of the country. I do not propose now or at any other time to forsake that principle or to forsake that position, for any other decision will simply mean the alternative, namely, Government control.

Perhaps it is not telling tales out of school to say that sometime in the course of this session the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before one of the committees of the House and, when the question was submitted as to why he did not let the farmer alone to obtain parity prices in the open market, by inference and almost expressly he stated that it would mean the losing of control of the American farmer. That is involved here now as it has been in every palliative that has ever been voted by this and by the other body. There can be no free and traditional agriculture unless there be free and uncontrolled farmers who are not held in dependency upon Federal aid. That means that there must be adequate prices. Palliatives such as here proposed are no substitute for adequate prices.

Now it is proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina to strike the House language so that the funds that are carried in this bill can be used for purposes other than for soil compliances and water conservation practices. Those are things that run to the soil, those are things that run to the enrichment of a natural resource. Everything else, of course, is on an individual basis in the form of a production payment or an incentive payment. There is ample money in this bill for soil compliances; in fact, it would require only \$200,000,000, yet on the basis of the vote of this body the other day there is \$400,000,000 carried in this bill, but the money cannot be expended unless the House chooses today to vote down its earlier position and adopt the language whereby the money can be used for incentive and for production payments.

I contended that there was no obligation on the part of the Congress in this

respect, and I went back to find the official document of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration which was issued on the 3d day of December 1942. I read you this language from this official document as indicated on page 36:

The provisions of the 1943 program are necessarily subject to such legislation affecting said program as the Congress of the United States may hereafter enact; the making of the payments herein provided are contingent upon such appropriation as the Congress may hereafter provide for such purpose.

That was as early as December 1942, when the program was first announced.

On the 3d day of June 1943 there was a summarization of the whole program in a very effective brochure, and there again on page 40 appears this language:

The provisions of the 1943 program are necessarily subject to such legislation affecting said program as the Congress of the United States may hereafter enact; the making of the payments herein provided are contingent upon such appropriation as the Congress may hereafter provide for such purpose.

There never was any question at any time in any of the official literature of the Department of Agriculture that this was a wholly contingent program. That is reason number one why I stand by the House position.

Reason number two is this. Every quota on every commodity with the exception of cotton has been suspended. Let me repeat that. Every quota on basic commodities with the exception of cotton has been suspended.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is in error. Quotas are now in effect on tobacco, and it would be very unfortunate if those quotas were lifted. It would be calculated to completely destroy the food program for the Nation, because the farmers in our section of the country prefer to grow tobacco.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Quotas are still in operation on corn, unless a farmer plants 90 percent of the war crop goals.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, that is right, but I am speaking of the basic quotas on corn and wheat as contemplated under the 1938 act. The lid has been taken off.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is mistaken on that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is not mistaken. The gentleman has for his authority the words of the Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency before our committee itself. The Agricultural Adjustment Act Administrator has testified time and time again that those quotas have been taken off. I grant you, of course, that there has to be a 90 percent compliance with the so-called war quota, but I am speaking about the amount of corn that the

farmer can raise or the amount of wheat that a farmer can raise if he is disposed to do so. In that respect the gentleman from Illinois is correct. If this needs further argument, I respectfully refer any member of this House to pages 710, 711, and 712 of the House hearings where the testimony of the Administrator can be found. I rely upon the record.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. One point that has never been covered to my satisfaction or never attempted to be covered, as far as I can understand, and I think it is important, is whether the farmers themselves understood, first, that the Secretary of Agriculture had the authority to promise this payment and, second, whether they understood that it was contingent upon an appropriation by the Congress that might not be made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Secretary of Agriculture has stated that his authority is derived from the two basic acts, but has always stated at all times, in the press, over the radio, and through the instrumentality of departmental bulletins, that it was always contingent upon appropriations hereafter to be made by the Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. In fairness, does not that situation obtain with regard to every other commitment which has been made in the past? Are not all of these commitments contingent upon the Congress, in good faith carrying out the commitments made by the Secretary?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There are two differences. Let me point out what they are. The first is that at no time in the past have the quotas been taken off. The very purpose of acreage allotment payments was to offset diminished acreage by a payment from the Treasury. The very purpose of the payment was to secure compliance with the acreage plan. The quotas have now been lifted. The second difference lies in the fact that under Executive order, every payment made hereunder will be credited in determining parity prices under the Price Act. In one moment we tell the farmer that here is a payment on a limited amount of your crop. In the next breath we say that it will be deducted from a determination of parity prices on his whole crop. Do you consider that a service to the farmer?

So, first of all, this was contingent; second, the quotas have been suspended; third, this is a palliative which has been repudiated by the House on several occasions only last week. Finally, it does not run to the soil. It does not enrich a natural resource. The other thing is this, and I point this out particularly to the gentleman from North Carolina, under the directive issued by the President of the United States, which was the provoca-

tion for the introduction of the Bankhead bill, the President said that in determining ceiling price for a commodity, every payment made to the farmer would be deducted for the purpose of that calculation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is that still in?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is, by Presidential fiat. Of course, they undertook to undo it by means of the Bankhead bill, but as the gentleman will remember, it failed in the Senate in overriding the veto.

So these payments will be deducted. So what good do they do? If we are going to be consistent in the position we took last week, then the thing to do is to vote down the preferential motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] under which he proposes that the House recede from its earlier and very consistent position.

I can only reaffirm the position which I have consistently taken for a long time. Pay the farmer for those practices which enrich and conserve the soil. That is fair and proper. That conserves and rebuilds a great natural resource.

Thereafter give him the fullest measure of freedom in operating his land. Assure him a fair price for his products and he will do the rest. The whole history of farm production stands as eloquent testimony to the capacity, the resourcefulness, the patriotism, and the diligence of the American farm in producing food and fiber. He needs no bureaucratic control from Washington.

Yet here are these ever present lures of small payments as a substitute for adequate prices. Every payment has a string to it. That is the string of Federal control.

None of them will serve as a substitute for good prices in the open market place. As Governor Townsend, the A. A. Administrator expressed it to the committee: The greatest incentive in the world is a good big price. You cannot beat it.

Is it not high time that we forsake these efforts to control the farmer and give him the fullest measure of freedom to work out his own destiny. He will do it because he has always done it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the present situation, if this House is to be consistent, we must vote for the Fulmer motion because just last week the House approved \$400,000,000 for the purpose of redeeming the good faith of the Government to the extent that the good faith of the Government was involved in these commitments. The very adroit argument made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would lead this House to believe that the proposition of subsidies is involved here. A subsidy,

as it is usually understood, is not here involved. These payments are made under the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and this Congress authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make the commitments. Now, in good faith, the Congress ought to direct the Secretary to carry out the commitments he has made. By calling it a subsidy the opposition hopes to bring the proposition into disrepute because subsidies at the present time appear to be in the "doghouse," so far as Congress is concerned. There is but one outstanding thing involved in this matter, and that is the good faith of the Government and the morale of our farmers. The payments are being made under the Soil Conservation Act which the Congress passed. I have never regarded these payments as subsidies. The payments are for the purpose of encouraging an improvement of the topsoil of the agricultural lands of America which will inure to the benefit of generations yet unborn. It is a national investment in the greatest national resource.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman knows that the Solicitor for the Department of Agriculture has held that this soil conservation money can be used for incentive or subsidy payments?

Mr. COOLEY. Well, you can call it incentive or subsidy or whatever you want to call it. It is payment for compliance, and compliance means the diversification of crops.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. FULMER. In the very next section we take care of that. I propose to offer an amendment that not one dime of this money can be used for incentive payments. That ought to be satisfactory to every Member of the House.

Mr. COOLEY. I am serious about this. I think that in good faith we ought to keep these commitments.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the Fulmer motion is adopted, it will result in substantially the same payments being made for compliance for soil improvement as have been made in previous years under the A. A. program?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely correct. We certainly should provide the money without any restrictions upon it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, there is a question of principle involved here, and the House should understand very clearly the question that is involved.

The motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment is an amendment to permit the Government to carry out the commitment which the farmer understood was made by the Govern-

ment when he, the farmer, signed up last fall for the 1943 crop year.

If Members are confused about this, and vote to renege on that agreement, they will have much explaining to do. Let me illustrate:

I have a letter from a farmer who plants winter wheat. He had to decide before he planted his wheat what his 1943 crop plans would be. He had then to decide whether he would sign up on the 1943 triple-A program. He did decide. He decided to shift some of his winter wheat crop land to other crops more wanted in the war effort. To do this, he had to buy some equipment for handling crops other than wheat. He borrowed money at the bank to do so. He counted, he still counts on the Government making good to him the promise of certain A. A. A. payments if he farmed in compliance with his agreement.

Now this winter wheat farmer has kept his part of the bargain. He is not in position to change the bargain if he wanted to. Certainly it is unfair if the Government, now through Congress, says it will not permit the appropriations already agreed upon to be used to carry out the bargain.

The gentleman from Illinois has raised the point that quotas were lifted for wheat and corn. That is beside the point. The quotas were lifted—but not until after that farmer planted his wheat. They were lifted along in January and February and this farmer had to plant his winter wheat months before that. I am advised that for the farmers who produce 70 percent of our national wheat crop the lifting of quotas came too late for them to increase their wheat acreage.

Now do not be confused.

The proposal to permit the funds to be used for crop adjustment payments is nothing new. The only new thing is to propose that the money be not used for such a purpose. Under the Soil Conservation Act of 1936 and the Farm Act of 1938, money has been payable for two types of compliance—soil and water conservation practices and crop adjustment programs.

If the Congress wants to say that in the future, on crops not yet planted, for crop years not yet planned and committed, the funds shall not be used to pay for anything except strict soil and water conservation practices, that would be another matter. But the proposal before us is to make such a proposition retroactive.

Keep this fact clearly in mind: the purposes for which the money would be payable under the Senate amendment are the purposes for which the money has been payable for at least the past 4 years, conservation and crop adjustment.

The confusion, if any, comes about because of the talk about an incentive payment program that came along in February. About 100 million dollars of new money was asked for that, and the

subcommittee turned the request down. They did it at their first meeting, I understand, by a vote of 6 to 1. Very properly they announced their action at the time so that the Department of Agriculture and the farmers would be on notice. But they did not then, and never afterward served notice on the farmers that the 1943 crop contracts presented in the fall, signed up in December, and acted upon by the farmers, like the wheat farmer I have cited, would be changed or the bases for payment changed.

If you want to change the rules for next year, that is all right if you do it in advance. If you want to reaffirm the committee's action on incentive payments, that is not going to violate the contract I have cited. But on the matter now pending, keep faith. Do not change the rules on payment after the farmer has planted his crop and operated his farm on the terms announced to him last December.

Under permission granted by the House, I include the following letter and tables supplied by the Department of Agriculture:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: In compliance with your request by telephone June 29, 1943, we are submitting some information regarding the commitments of the Department of Agriculture on 1943 program payments to farmers for the production of war crops and for carrying out soil-conservation practices.

The original 1943 program of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, has announced and presented to farmers in the fall of 1942, provided allotments for the 1943 crops of corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts, and payments for planting within such allotments. These allotment payments which were in addition to the soil-conservation practice payments, were subject to appropriations by Congress and were contingent upon the planting of specified adapted crops urgently needed in the war effort. That is, the allotment payment would be made if the farm devoted a certain amount of land to the production of war crops, such as soybeans, flax, potatoes, peanuts, hemp, etc.

As the war progressed and more information became available on the requirements for our armed forces, allies, and for the rehabilitation of people in occupied countries, it was found necessary to modify the provisions of the original program to obtain increased production of wheat and corn.

On January 8, 1943, the limitations on the planting of corn were removed and on February 23, 1943, marketing quotas and allotment recreations were removed from the 1943 wheat crop.

At the time winter wheat was planted in the fall of 1942, these original provisions were in effect and almost all of the winter-wheat farmers complied with them by planting within their allotments. For these farmers who produce about 70 percent of the Nation's wheat, the modifications in the program came too late for them to increase their 1943 wheat acreage.

Marketing quotas and allotment restrictions are still in effect for the 1943 crops of cotton and tobacco, and the performance of

farmers with respect to these two crops as well as winter wheat was in good faith and the commitments of the Government appear to be valid since they were in accordance with the laws under which the farm programs are administered.

The removal of limitations on the planting of corn and spring wheat before planting time made it necessary for us to provide measures to obtain the urgently needed acreages of war crops which would have to compete with corn and spring wheat.

The difficulty of obtaining the desired production of war crops in the Corn Belt and in the spring wheat area was intensified by the removal of limitations on the planting of wheat and corn which are more profitable than the adapted war crops. About 90 percent of soybeans and approximately 50 percent of canning crops are produced in the Corn Belt and almost all of the flax is produced in the spring wheat area.

The 1943 program as finally determined contemplated the expenditure of about \$400,000,000 to farmers for production of these needed war crops and for carrying out soil-conservation practices.

This amount, after deductions for administrative expenses, naval stores, and insular division, was to have been divided about equally between payments for conservation practices and payments to assist farmers in shifting crops urgently needed for the war effort. War crop goals have been established on approximately 80 percent of the more than 6,000,000 farms in the country.

The commitments of the Government as presented to farmers provided that the payment, which otherwise would have been made for planting within allotments, would be made if farmers who signed a farm plan planted at least 90 percent of the total war crop goal established for the farm.

The amount of this payment for each farm was to have been equal to the payment which otherwise would have been computed on the allotments of corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. The intent of this payment was to partially compensate farmers for the smaller returns they would receive from the war crops.

In almost every instance, a considerably less return per acre is received from the war crops than is obtained from the competing crops of corn, wheat, cotton, etc. This fact is illustrated in tables I, II, and IIa, in which comparisons of gross returns per acre are shown for corn and soybeans, corn and flax, and for wheat and flax. We would like to point out that the gross returns from the war crop are less than from the competing crop in all States for which data are shown.

The high degree of participation by farmers in the 1943 program indicates that they have responded to the commitments of the Government with respect to these payments. The extent of their participation is shown in table III in which the indicated 1943 acreages of some of the urgently needed crops are compared with the 1942 acreages of such crops. The 1943 acreage of flax is 29 percent greater than the 1942 acreage. The soybean acreage is up 18.5 percent; potatoes, 13.6 percent; dry edible beans, 16.2 percent; dry field peas, 35 percent; and peanuts, 12.5 percent.

We would like to assure you that we appreciate this opportunity of supplying you with this information. If we can be of further service, please call on us.

Very truly yours,

LEROY K. SMITH,
Director, North Central Division.

TABLE I.—Comparison of gross returns per acre from corn and soybeans

[Yield shown in bushels]

State	Corn		Soybeans		Difference in favor of corn (2) - (4)	Percent soybean value is of corn
	Yield ¹	Cash value ²	Yield ¹	Cash value ³		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Ill.....	47.6	\$49.98	21.2	\$30.22	\$19.76	78
Ind.....	43.4	45.57	17.0	31.45	14.12	69
Iowa.....	48.9	51.34	19.1	35.34	16.00	69
Minn.....	39.6	41.58	15.7	29.04	12.54	70
Mo.....	27.8	29.19	12.2	22.57	6.62	77
Ohio.....	44.4	46.62	19.0	35.15	11.47	75

¹ Yields for both corn and soybeans represent the 1937-41 weighted average.

² Cash value of corn determined on basis of \$1.05 per bushel.

³ Cash value of soybeans determined on basis of loan rate of \$1.85 per bushel.

TABLE II.—Comparison of gross returns per acre from corn and flax

[Yield shown in bushels]

State	Corn		Flax		Difference in favor of corn (2) - (4)	Percent flax value is of corn
	Yield	Value ²	Yield	Value ³		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Iowa.....	48.9	\$51.34	10.6	\$28.51	\$22.83	56
Minn.....	39.6	41.58	9.9	26.93	14.65	65
S. Dak.....	19.2	20.16	7.0	18.83	1.33	93

¹ All data for districts 3 and 6, in which most of the flax is grown.

² Value of corn determined on basis of \$1.05 per bushel.

³ Value of flax determined on basis of local loan rates.

TABLE IIa.—Comparison of gross returns per acre from wheat and flax

[Yield shown in bushels]

State	Wheat		Flax		Difference in favor of wheat (2) - (4)	Percent flax value is of wheat
	Yield ¹	Value ²	Yield ¹	Value ³		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Mont.....	11.4	\$15.50	4.4	\$12.54	\$2.96	81
N. Dak.....	10.3	14.01	4.3	12.26	1.75	88

¹ Yields for both wheat and flax represent the 1937-41 weighted average.

² Value of wheat determined on basis of \$1.36 at Minneapolis.

³ Value of flax determined on basis of \$2.85 at Minneapolis.

TABLE III.—Planted acreages of some urgently needed crops with 1943 and 1942 comparisons

	1942 planted acres	Indicated 1943 planted acres	1943 planted acres as percent of 1942 planted acres
Corn.....	91,011,000	96,827,000	106.4
Flax.....	4,691,000	6,051,000	129.0
Soybeans.....	10,762,000	12,750,000	118.5
Potatoes.....	2,793,000	3,174,000	113.6
Beans, dry edible.....	2,135,000	2,480,000	116.2
Peas, dry field.....	501,000	677,000	135.1
Peanuts.....	4,647,000	5,230,000	112.5

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I think the fundamental issue here was well stated

by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. That issue is whether the Federal Government will carry out the commitments which it has made to the farmers of this country.

It is true that commitments which the Department of Agriculture may make in advance of appropriations are subject to whatever action Congress may take in making the appropriation. That is true in the case of every appropriation we make. The men in the Army of the United States getting \$50 a month do not get their pay unless we appropriate the money; we take them into the Army, we tell them they will get \$50 a month, but if we fail to appropriate the money they will not get it.

There has been as much of a commitment in connection with the payment of those sums of money to farmers for carrying out their part of the farm program as there could possibly be in connection with any dealings which the Federal Government has with its citizens. These farmers who signed up in our present farm program understood when they signed up that there were to be certain definite payments made. They had every reason to believe these commitments would be kept. For years these promises and agreements had been made and kept on the part of the Federal Government.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Is it not true that the Department of Agriculture was authorized under the law to make these commitments?

Mr. HOPE. The Department of Agriculture is authorized, under the Triple A Act of 1938, to make commitments, just as fully as any Government agency is authorized to make any commitments.

There is a provision still in conference which states that for next year these commitments are not to be made. That is all right. I am in favor of not making commitments for another year, but there we serve notice in advance; we modify the fundamental law in that particular; but as long as we have that law on the statute books authorizing commitments to be made and as long as the Secretary of Agriculture, acting under that law, has gone out and made these commitments, as long as farmers have signed up contracts relying on those assurances, then I say that in good faith we ought to go ahead and appropriate the money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOPE. We really passed on that question last week when we agreed to the Senate amendment increasing the amount of the appropriation from \$360,000,000 to \$400,000,000.

It will not take anything like \$400,000,000 to make practice payments; it will take less than \$200,000,000. The remainder of the money can be used only for making the regular triple A payments. I am satisfied that when a majority of the House voted to increase the amount they meant that these triple A payments should be made. The fact that on a later

vote the purpose for which the \$400,000,000 could be used was limited to practice payments indicates that some Members misunderstood the issue on which they were voting and the purpose for which the increase was made.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. What is the other payment to be made except soil conservation payments?

Mr. HOPE. The payment which is made to farmers who comply with the program, such as adjusting their acreage of the basic crops—and planting the required acreage of war crops.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, may I state for the information of the Members of the House that the next amendment to be voted on is amendment No. 88. I propose to move to recede and concur with the following amendment:

In lieu of the language stricken by the amendment insert: Provided no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for an incentive payment as defined in House Document 101, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.

This amendment should be satisfactory and I am going to ask your approval of same.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, one thing in which I am interested in connection with this subject matter is that we if possible perfect a bill for transmission to the President before the end of the fiscal year. We have now reached the point where the two houses have agreed upon every matter of controversy contained in the bill with the exception of the limitations upon the use of the \$400,000,000, upon the amount of which both Houses have agreed, for soil conservation and production payments; and the matter of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation appropriation which is still in dispute. Everything else with the exception of these two subject matters has been agreed to by both Houses, and if it is possible for this House without doing violence to any conscientious convictions that its membership may entertain to agree to a procedure which will result in an agreement and in the sending of the bill to the President, I would be very glad for that end to be achieved.

I offered the motion to further insist upon our disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87. There are three amendments in disagreement which relate to this \$400,000,000 which Congress by action of both Houses proposed to make available for soil conservation payments and production payments. We are now considering the first one. The second one will

be the limitation imposed when the bill was in the House with relation to the making of incentive payments. There is still a third amendment, No. 92, by which the Senate undertook to strike out language which was included in the House bill which would limit the program for next year to soil conservation and water conservation benefits, and the over-all amount of the commitments that can be made next year to \$300,000,000.

I made the motion on behalf of the committee because it represented the views of a majority of the committee that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 87, but I think that factor does not preclude me from stating to you what I think would be a fair basis of compromise for the positions of the two Houses. The other days, as you will recall, this House voted by a majority of 10 not to recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 87. The Senate yesterday, voting on the same question, insisted upon its position, with only two Senators voting to the contrary. So you will observe that a tremendously greater majority of the Senate is insisting upon the Senate provision than there is of the House insisting upon the House position. The House was almost evenly divided.

I think a fair compromise of this matter would be to recede from our disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 87, to recede with the amendment offered by Mr. FULMER and concur in Senate amendment numbered 88, and then to insist upon our position with regard to Senate amendment numbered 92. If you do that, I have assurances that the Senate will then recede on amendment numbered 92, which is the amendment that limits the program for the next year. If you take these actions, the effect will be that you will permit this program of the Secretary announced last fall to be carried out in accordance with his commitments for the present year. At the same time you will serve notice you will limit his authority for the next year by this language stricken out by Senate amendment numbered 92. You will serve notice on the farmers of the country that next year they will not be able to get the same types of payments they got heretofore, that they will not be able to get any type of payments except for soil-conservation and water-conservation practices.

That, in my judgment, is all right so far as next year is concerned. But so far as this year is concerned when the Secretary of Agriculture under the authority of law, section 16 of the Domestic Allotment and Soil Conservation Act, has committed the Government up to \$400,000,000 for the types of payment that have been made heretofore and which were contemplated this year, and after the farmers have executed their farm plans accepting the proposal of the Secretary, I do not think it is good conscience to repudiate that obligation. Next year, all right, we have the right to make such plans and such limitations as we deem proper for next year.

The gentleman from Illinois referred to this as a matter of principle. It is a matter of principle with me. I think the Government of the United States ought to comply with its promises to everybody to whom it makes promises or to whom any official of the Government makes promises by authority of law and no question has ever been raised by anyone, so far as I know, but that the Secretary of Agriculture had the authority of law to make the promises that he made on December 5, 1942, to the farmers of this country to make to them certain types of payments, and I say we ought to make good on them.

We should then limit the program for the next fiscal year by insisting upon the language which the Senate struck out in amendment numbered 92. You talk about incentive payments. I do not know whether anyone has a clear idea of what an incentive payment is or not, but on page 734 of the hearings there is a statement in detail of the type of payments which it is intended to make out of this \$400,000,000 which the House language might not allow to be made. In other words, the House, if its position should continue as it has been, would be taking an attitude of appropriating the money, then refusing to allow the payments to be made if a narrow definition of "incentive payments" should be adopted. The Secretary's plan provides for the payment on cotton of \$77,223,000, to corn \$50,293,000, to wheat \$59,884,000, and to tobacco and other crops in stated amounts as you will observe from reading the hearings. These payments have been promised by the Secretary of Agriculture under authority of law to the producers of these various commodities throughout the United States and it seems to me that we would not be acting in good faith to repudiate his promise.

I hope, therefore, that the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] to recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 87 will prevail. I expect to vote for it myself, and I expect to vote for his motion with regard to Senate amendment No. 88 to recede and concur with an amendment which will prohibit the payment of incentive payments of the type which were estimated for in House Document No. 101. Let us not make any mistake; it was House Document No. 101 that the committee refused to approve. House Document No. 101 and the \$100,000,000 which was estimated therein is not in this bill and never has been in this bill, so that if we adopt the motion which the gentleman from South Carolina has offered with reference to Senate amendment numbered 88, it will prohibit the making from this fund of incentive payments as described in that House document.

Just what is an incentive payment? If you pay a man to terrace his farm or to improve his farm, is that an incentive payment? It is open to some difference of opinion, but, at any rate, if you take these actions you will take what has been the viewpoint of the majority of the House and you will enable the farmers of the country to receive the money that has been promised to them, at the same time you will limit the program for next

year so that nothing but soil-conservation and water-conservation payments can be made for the next year. I want to heartily approve the nonpartisan arguments which have been advanced from both sides of the aisle by members of the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], than whom there is no more loyal friend of agriculture in the House, has advocated concurring in the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, and on the Democratic side the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, is supported by his Democratic colleagues. It seems to me that there is every good reason, especially in view of the fact we are approaching the end of the fiscal year and that the Senate has yielded to us on many important items in this bill, that we ought to be able to agree to the motion offered by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, settle this matter once and for all and get this bill out of the way and send it down to the White House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not about time that we stop the Department of Agriculture from making promises in advance on something where the money is not appropriated?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I can subscribe to that statement. Too many commitments have been made not only by the Department of Agriculture but also other Federal officials before these officials came to the Congress to secure consent for what they did. Then they try to bind us not only on their domestic commitments but also on commitments made to foreign countries.

I think the best service we could perform here today would be to shake loose the dependency of the farmers upon the United States Treasury. The farmers do not want money out of the United States Treasury, they do not want subsidies, nor do they want incentive payments.

We all believe in soil conservation, and the money that is provided in this act should be used exactly for that purpose. We know that if the funds are approved without the House amendment the Secretary of Agriculture and his Solicitor will rule that they can use the money for incentive or subsidy or any other type of payment. The farmers do not want this money. They want fair and decent prices at the market places and they want to be free from bureaucratic domination from Washington. We can perform that service today. I do not know of a single farmer who feels that a commitment has been made to him for funds out of the United States Treasury.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When Governor Townsend, the Administrator, was before the committee I asked this question: "What in your judgment, Governor, is the best incentive for securing production?" His answer was, "A good big price. You cannot beat it."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The farmers are well satisfied with the prices they are receiving today, and they will gladly waive any payment that they might receive as an incentive or subsidy from the United States Treasury. Let us vote to make the farmers free, and give them a square deal in the market place for the things they produce.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday we had up the Commodity Credit Corporation bill to prohibit subsidies. That prohibition was approved by a large majority of the Congress. But do you know what you did? You wrote in there, although the subsidies had never been authorized by law, that any commitments which had been made up to the time of the passage of the act should be carried out.

I am asking you here today to take care of the farmers who acted on this handbook which was distributed to them months ago. You did the honorable thing last Friday and I believe you are going to do the honorable thing now. You said last Friday, "Those subsidies were not authorized by law. We are against them. But we hereby authorize you to carry out any commitments you have made up to the time of the passage of this act." That is exactly what the gentleman from South Carolina is asking you today, to carry out the commitments that have been made up to this time, and then say later in this bill that you are not going to do it any more.

You noticed in the correspondence between Chester Davis and the President yesterday that Mr. Davis said he had the farm program for 1944 in shape where it could be announced on the 15th day of July. That is the program for next year. This year's program was worked out last June, July, and August, and in the fall it was announced to the farmers.

I say to you, I believe you should feel as I feel, you being the keeper of your conscience as I am the keeper of mine, that we owe it to the farmers of this Nation, having permitted the program to be announced and told them, for instance, that for each bushel of wheat they produce they will receive a payment of 9.2 cents provided they produce certain war crops, which they have planted and which they are producing today. I say we cannot escape it. I do not like it. I do not like it a bit, because they are going to take that 9 cents away from him when he goes to sell his wheat, unless we can change the program; but at this hour I have some hope that within 30 days we will change that situation and that 9 cents will not be deducted from the market price.

Above everything else, I ask you today to do no more than you did last Friday when you protected the canners and packers on any commitments which have been made on subsidies. How can you escape the responsibility of protecting every farmer in this Nation on the commitment that was made to them, not 3 weeks ago, but months and months ago?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 92, noes 112.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 197, nays 174, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]
YEAS—197

Abernethy	Gore	Newsome
Allen, La.	Gorski	Norrell
Andersen,	Gossett	Norton
H. Carl	Grant, Ala.	O'Brien, Mich.
Anderson,	Green	O'Connor
N. Mex.	Gregory	O'Konski
Barrett	Hagen	Outland
Beckworth	Hare	Pace
Bland	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Bonner	Harris, Ark.	Patton
Boykin	Harris, Va.	Peterson, Fla.
Bradley, Pa.	Hart	Peterson, Ga.
Brooks	Hays	Pfeifer
Brown, Ga.	Heffernan	Poage
Bryson	Hendricks	Price
Bulwinkle	Hill	Priest
Burch, Va.	Hobbs	Rabaut
Burchill, N. Y.	Hoch	Ramspeck
Burdick	Hoeven	Randolph
Camp	Holmes, Wash.	Rankin
Cannon, Fla.	Hope	Richards
Carlson, Kans.	Hull	Robertson
Case	Jackson	Robinson, Utah
Celler	Jerman	Robison, Ky.
Chapman	Johnson,	Rogers, Calif.
Clark	J. Leroy	Rowan
Coffee	Johnson,	Sabath
Colmer	Lyndon B.	Sadowski
Cooley	Johnson, Okla.	Sasser
Cooper	Kee	Satterfield
Costello	Kefauver	Sauthoff
Courtney	Kelley	Sikes
Cox	Kennedy	Smith, Va.
Cravens	Keogh	Smith, W. Va.
Creal	Kerr	Snyder
Crosser	Kirwan	Sparkman
Cullen	Klein	Spence
Cunningham	Lane	Starnes, Ala.
Curley	Lanham	Steagall
Curtis	Laracade	Stefan
D'Alesandro	Lea	Stewart
Davis	Lemke	Stockman
Dawson	Lesinski	Sullivan
Delaney	Lynch	Sumner, Ill.
Dickstein	McCord	Summers, Tex.
Dies	McCormack	Talle
Dillweg	McGehee	Tarver
Dingell	McGranery	Thomas, Tex.
Domengeaux	McKenzie	Thomason
Doughton	McMillan	Vincent, Ky.
Drewry	McMurray	Voorhis, Calif.
Eberharter	Madden	Walter
Elliott	Magnuson	Ward
Feighan	Mahon	Weaver
Fernandez	Maloney	Weiss
Fisher	Manasco	Wene
Flannagan	Mansfield,	Whelchel, Ga.
Fogarty	Mont.	White
Forand	Marcantonio	Whitten
Fulbright	Martin, Iowa	Whittington
Fulmer	Miller, Nebr.	Wickersham
Gale	Mills	Winstead
Gathings	Monroney	Woodrum, Va.
Gavagan	Mundt	Worley
Gibson	Murdock	Wright
Gilchrist	Murphy	Zimmerman
Gillie	Murray, Tenn.	
Gordon	Myers	

NAYS—174

Allen, Ill.	Graham	Mruk
Anderson, Calif.	Grant, Ind.	Murray, Wis.
Andersen,	Griffiths	Norman
August H.	Gross	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews	Gwynne	O'Brien, N. Y.
Angell	Hale	O'Neal
Arends	Hall	Pittenger
Arnold	Leonard W.	Ploeser
Auchincloss	Halleck	Poulson
Baldwin, Md.	Hancock	Powers
Beall	Harness, Ind.	Pracht
Bell	Heidinger	Ramey
Bender	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Mo.	Hinshaw	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Hoffman	Rees, Kans.
Blackney	Holmes, Mass.	Elizabeth
Bolton	Horan	Rockwell
Boren	Howell	Rodgers, Pa.
Brehm	Jeffrey	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins	Rohrbough
Buffett	Jennings	Rolph
Busbey	Jensen	Rowe
Butler	Johnson,	Schiffner
Canfield	Anton J.	Schuetz
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson,	Schwabe
Carson, Ohio	Calvin D.	Scott
Carter	Johnson, Ind.	Shafer
Chenoweth	Jones	Simpson, Ill.
Chiperfield	Jonkman	Simpson, Pa.
Church	Judd	Slaughter
Clason	Kean	Smith, Maine
Clevenger	Kearney	Smith, Ohio
Cole, N. Y.	Keefe	Smith, Wis.
Compton	Kilday	Springer
Crawford	Kinzer	Stearns, N. H.
Day	Knutson	Stevenson
Dewey	Kunkel	Sundstrom
Dirksen	LaFollette	Taber
Disney	Lambertson	Talbot
Ditter	Landis	Taylor
Dondero	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas	LeFevre	Tibbott
Durham	Lewis	Towe
Dworshak	Ludlow	Troutman
Ellis	McCowan	Vursell
Ellison, Md.	McGregor	Wadsworth
Ellsworth	McLean	Wastelowski
Elmer	McWilliams	Welch, Ohio
Elston, Ohio	Maas	Welch
Engel	Martin, Mass.	West
Fenton	Mason	Wigglesworth
Fish	May	Willey
Gamble	Merrow	Wilson
Gavin	Michener	Winter
Gearhart	Miller, Conn.	Wolcott
Gerlach	Miller, Mo.	Wolverton, N. J.
Gifford	Miller, Pa.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gillette	Monkiewicz,	
Goodwin	Mott	

NOT VOTING—60

Baldwin, N. Y.	Gallagher	O'Leary
Barden	Granger	O'Toole
Barry	Hall	Phillips
Bates, Ky.	Edwin Arthur	Phillips
Bates, Mass.	Hartley	Plumley
Bloom	Hébert	Rivers
Bradley, Mich.	Hollfield	Russell
Buckley	Izac	Scanlon
Burgin	Johnson,	Sheppard
Byrne	Luther A.	Sheridan
Capozzoli	Johnson, Ward	Short
Cochran	Kilburn	Somers, N. Y.
Cole, Mo.	King	Stanley
Culkin	Kleberg	Tolan
Eaton	Luce	Treadway
Fay	Mansfield, Tex.	Van Zandt
Fellows	Merritt	Vinson, Ga.
Fitzpatrick	Morrison, La.	Vorys, Ohio
Folger	Morrison, N. C.	Wheat
Ford	Nichols	Wolfenden, Pa.
Furlong	O'Hara	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York against.

Mr. Luther A. Johnson for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Bloom for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Merritt for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Scanlon for, with Mr. Cole of Missouri against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Somers of New York for, with Miss Stanley against.

Mr. Byrne for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

General pairs:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wheat.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hollfield with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.

Mr. Cochran with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. King with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Fellows.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I was in the Hall and listening and heard my name called, but I could not get up here in time to answer. That is the position I am in.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall, and did he hear his name called?

Mr. FOLGER. I was; yes, sir. I tried to get up here so that the Clerk could hear me, but I could not make it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman did not answer?

Mr. FOLGER. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman says he was in the Hall and listening and failed to hear his name called, he qualifies.

Mr. FOLGER. I was listening and heard my name called, but I could not answer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H. R. 2714, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 5; insist on further disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 60 and 61, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of what amendment is being disagreed to?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are two amendments still in disagreement. One amendment relates to restrictions upon expenditures from the President's fund, and the other relates to the denial of salary to three men charged with subversive affiliations.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

LXXXIX—426

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 88: Page 69, line 20, strike out all of lines 24 and 25 and the words "incentive payments" on page 70.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 88.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] for the purpose of offering a preferential motion.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FULMER moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment numbered 88 with an amendment, as follows: "In lieu of the language stricken by the amendment insert 'Provided, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments as defined in House Document 101, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.'"

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] 2 minutes.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to take very much time on this motion. The language written in by the Senate speaks for itself. I believe it is in line with the wishes of the Members of the House. It is certainly in line with my ideas in connection with the operation of the soil-conservation and domestic-allotment program. The reason I have advocated the retention of the \$400,000,000 was to carry out different contracts with farmers in connection with the soil-conservation and production program, and for the further reason that I do not believe, in the midst of this great emergency, when the farmers are having everything on the face of the earth to contend with, that this is the time to break faith with these farmers.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. What is the definition of "incentive payments" as given in this House document?

Mr. FULMER. The House document refers to various crops other than the major crops that would receive benefits under this appropriation in connection with the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. The purpose of this amendment is not to use any of this money for incentive payments, referred to by the Secretary of Agriculture last spring.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in February the Secretary of Agriculture came before the Subcommittee on Agriculture and asked for \$125,000,000 with which to pay incentive payments. One hundred million dollars of that was to be taken out of the moneys that are provided under the authority carried herein. There was another source for \$25,000,000, making in all \$125,000,000. The money was to be used for a very specific purpose, namely, for some 16 crops, which included Irish

potatoes and sweetpotatoes, carrots and onions, soya beans, and various other types of commodities. House Document 101, to which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] refers, would provide \$125,000,000 for incentive payments on this particular assortment of commodities. That proposal was rejected by the subcommittee by a vote of 6 to 1. Nothing thereafter happened. However, when this bill came on the floor, we wrote in this proviso, which was subsequently approved by the House:

Provided, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments.

That is reasonably definite language. That means that not a single dollar in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944 can be used for the purpose of making incentive payments. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] proposes an amendment in lieu of the language that was carried in the bill, and in lieu of the language that was stricken by the Senate. He, in substance, provides that no part of any appropriation in this bill shall be used to pay incentive payments as defined in House Document 101. That means that no money in this bill shall be used for the payment of incentive payments on the 16 various crops that were defined to us in that House document. But you see what it will do?

It does, therefore, indirectly place the seal of approval on the payment of incentive payments for others than those agreed to or identified in House Document 101.

I personally cannot go along with that sort of thing because it offers an opportunity for discretionary action, and in fact it would permit the use of money for incentive payments for other than those crops; it would leave within administrative discretion of the Secretary, as advised by the solicitor of the Department, on which of the crops incentive payments might be paid, and that places the seal of approval on the limitation that has been rejected time and time again by the House, and so I hope that the motion will be defeated.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. In view of the vote the House has just taken with reference to the payments that were promised, and in view of the fact that in the eyes of some there is a question of what an incentive payment is, does not the gentleman think that this language would permit, perhaps, the same treatment, at least, avoid conflicts. I think that is the real purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, to avoid complications because of this other prohibition, and then authorize the payments that we have voted should be made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Georgia, I am sure, agrees with me that we are validating and approving a principle of incentive payments with respect to anything within the discretion of the

Secretary, except the sixteen-odd commodities mentioned in House Document 101.

Mr. PACE. If it is left to the Solicitor of the Department, that may be correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is left to administrative discretion.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I think the question arises as to what is an incentive payment.

Now, in the light of the whole legislative history, in the light of the fact that the action of the subcommittee served notice in February that no appropriations for the payment of incentive payments would be made, and as a matter of fact, with the legislative history of the bill, does the gentleman think he can give us a proper interpretation of incentive payments?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My definition is this: That any payment which inures to the enrichment of the soil or for water conservation practices must necessarily be considered as an incentive payment.

Let me therefore summarize the situation. Time and time again we have rejected the principle of incentive payments on the ground that they are but a palliative for adequate prices for farm products. We restated that position in this bill. The Fulmer motion now proposes to approve incentive payments provided they are not paid on the various crops outlined in Document No. 101. This motion should therefore be defeated.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the last remark made by the gentleman from Illinois was very significant and I hope that it did not escape your attention. He said that his contention is that any payment not made for the purpose of encouraging the improvement or conservation of the soil is an incentive payment. I cannot agree with that contention. In view of statements made in the House when the language stricken by Senate amendment No. 88 was adopted, I think "incentive payment" may be construed to be more restrictive in meaning.

The House has just voted to permit types of payment which are not payments for the improvement of the soil or for the conservation of the soil. It has just voted to permit production adjustment payments. Last week we voted to appropriate \$400,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$300,000,000 as proposed by the House, in order to make that particular type of payment as well as soil conservation and water conservation payments. Now the question is: Do you want to vote for a continuance of the inhibition against incentive payments in the language in the same section of the bill or do you want to permit the making of the type of payments for which the House and Senate have just appropriated the money and of which you have by two roll-call votes indicated your approval?

I do not agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] concerning his interpretation of the language of the

Fulmer amendment. The gentleman says that the language of the motion made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] means that it permits incentive payments except for such payments as were contemplated by House Document 101, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session. I think that clearly is not a correct construction of the language contained in the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina. His motion reads:

Incentive payments as defined in House Document 101, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.

In other words, that document defines what was expressly referred to therein as incentive payments, and any type of payment on any type of agricultural commodity which comes within that definition is inhibited by the terms of the Fulmer motion. At the same time, the votes of the House in agreeing to Senate amendments Nos. 86 and 87 indicate the purpose of the House to provide for payments of the Government's obligations under the program announced by the Secretary of Agriculture under authority of law on or about December 5, 1942.

All that you would do if you adopt the Fulmer motion would be to say to administrative authorities that "the type of incentive payment you want authority to make in this House Document 101 with reference to some types of commodities, that type of payment as defined therein you shall not make from this \$400,000,000 fund for any commodity"; but you have provided in the previous language that payments can be made to carry out the obligations of the Government as created under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and of the Domestic Allotment and Soil Conservation Act by the announcement made last fall by the Secretary of Agriculture. Now, is not that what you want to do? And it is what I suggested we ought to do in my judgment to endeavor to arrive at an agreement with the Senate and send this bill to the White House in discussing the first motion which was offered. If the House should not adopt this motion after having adopted the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], with reference to amendment No. 87, it would clearly be adopting two utterly inconsistent positions, although I do not think that even if the House language stricken by Senate amendment No. 88 remains in the bill payment for the program announced last fall can be prevented.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think we should make this clear. Does the gentleman feel that if the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina is now adopted it would still permit the payment of these incentive payments on the 16 crops referred to in this House document?

Mr. TARVER. Certainly not. I think if the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina is adopted it will expressly prohibit the making of payments of that kind.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I think, however, it will permit the carrying out of the program announced on December 5, 1942, under which certain production payments on cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, and other commodities were promised by the Secretary, and that if you do not adopt the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] it will still be a matter of some doubt as to whether or not the Government will be able to make those payments although the House has twice voted, once last week and again this afternoon, that it desired those types of payment made.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is not the effect of the Fulmer amendment to ratify and confirm what the Committee on Appropriations did when it denied and refused to make available \$125,000,000 for incentive payments?

Mr. TARVER. Absolutely so, and I think it is so clear that there ought to be no mistake about it. The discussion in the House has all been directed to the problem of whether or not we were going to carry out these commitments the Government, through the Secretary of Agriculture, announced in the fall of 1942. If the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina is adopted it is clearly apparent that we will be providing and that it will be construed to have been the intention of Congress to provide for the carrying out of that program which was promulgated last fall and at the same time to prohibit the making of the type of payments which were outlined in House Document 101, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, which the committee refused to approve. Without the Fulmer amendment language some doubt is cast on the Secretary's program although I still believe it could be carried out.

If you adopt this amendment, Mr. Speaker, with the exception of one other subject matter it completes the agricultural appropriation bill and I sincerely hope the vote of the House on this motion may be in line with the last two votes of the House relating to the same subject matter and that it may approve the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As long as the House has decided to permit these payments we should permit them to be made on these war crops which are needed in connection with the war effort rather than to confine them to cotton, corn, wheat, and these basic crops.

Mr. TARVER. The position of the House as I understand it from the last two votes has been that we should keep our contracts that were made last fall and limit payments in future the soil and

water conservation practices. We have another Senate amendment in the bill, No. 92, upon disagreement with which it is hoped the House will insist, which proposes to strike out language which would limit the payments for next year to soil conservation and water conservation practices. We think that language ought to stay in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired. Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we grow weary of well doing. The House long ago took an emphatic position, a consistent position, on this question and through this entire session has sustained its opposition to subsidies. And now some of those who have voted repeatedly against subsidies and for permanent stabilization of farm prices are advocating an amendment to undo all that has been accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, the debate this afternoon has been by the lawyers of the House rather than the farmers of the House. And it has been a typical small town justice of the peace debate. They have quibbled over hair-splitting technicalities and definitions—whether somebody agreed or did not agree—whether there was an implied contract or no contract—whether notice was given or not given, and so forth. And in the plethora of argument have completely lost sight of the one question before us—a square deal for the farmer.

May I interrupt this learned discussion by the legal lights of the House long enough to humbly submit the views of a farmer?

I sold my wool clip yesterday and got 2 cents a pound less than I got before the war. Now will you name any non-agricultural commodity—or any product of labor or industry—that is selling for less today than it sold for before the war?

Wheat slumped on the Chicago market following announcement of a Government loan 5 or 6 cents below the market just as harvest is starting. The corn crop in Missouri is a failure and there is no feed grain or protein supplement for sale. Livestock is down and the cost of production steadily mounting. Farmers are sending their stock to market half finished and are shipping their brood sows and herd cows. The Producers News Bulletin reports the largest hog run in history. Farmers are discontinuing feeding and local auction sales are off 20 to 40 percent.

The farmer alone is being pushed around. Nobody else is being penalized. The products, prices, and income of no other groups in the Nation are being rolled back. And yet there is neither beef nor pork to be had in many of the markets of this city. It will be realized when it is too late that meat has been rolled back and prices are low—but there is no meat.

And here is an amendment to authorize payment of subsidies and sabotage the program for stabilization of farm prices we have been working so long to establish.

Mr. Speaker, the House and the Congress have repeatedly denied subsidies. And every group in the country which wants cheap food and is seeking to exploit agriculture and lower the price of farm products is advocating subsidies.

Every member of the committee reporting this bill except one has voted against incentive payments and all other forms of subsidies every time the question has been voted on by the committee.

I trust the House will continue its opposition to subsidies and its demand for fair prices for farm products in the open market along with everybody else both now and after the war.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this motion will be voted down.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the pending motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 37, noes 114.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is not a quorum present and I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 177, nays 187, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—177

Abernethy	Domeneaux	Keogh
Allen, La.	Doughton	Kerr
Anderson, N. Mex.	Eberharter	Kirwan
Baldwin, Md.	Feighan	Klein
Barden	Fernandez	LaFollette
Bates, Ky.	Flannagan	Lane
Beckworth	Folger	Lanham
Bland	Forand	Lemke
Bonner	Fulmer	Lynch
Boykin	Gale	McCord
Bradley, Pa.	Gathings	McCormack
Brooks	Gavagan	McGehee
Brown, Ga.	Gibson	McGranery
Bryson	Gilchrist	McKenzie
Bulwinkle	Gillie	McMillan
Burch, Va.	Gordon	McMurray
Burchill, N. Y.	Gore	Madden
Burdick	Gorski	Magnuson
Camp	Grant, Ala.	Mahon
Cannon, Fla.	Green	Maloney
Carlson, Kans.	Gregory	Manasco
Celler	Hagen	Mansfield, Mont.
Chapman	Hare	Marcantonio
Clark	Harless, Ariz.	Martin, Iowa
Coffee	Harris, Va.	Miller, Nebr.
Colmer	Hays	Monroney
Cooley	Heffernan	Mott
Cooper	Hendricks	Murdock
Costello	Hill	Murphy
Courtney	Hobbs	Murray, Tenn.
Cox	Hoch	Myers
Cravens	Hoeben	Newsome
Creal	Holmes, Wash.	Nichols
Crosser	Hope	Norton
Cullen	Jackson	O'Brien, Mich.
Cunningham	Jarman	O'Connor
D'Alesandro	Johnson	Outland
Davis	J. Leroy	Pace
Dawson	Johnson, Okla.	Patman
Delaney	Kee	Patton
Dickstein	Kefauver	Peterson, Fla.
Dies	Kelley	Peterson, Ga.
Dillweg	Kennedy	Pfeifer
Dingell		Price

Priest	Smith, W. Va.	Weaver
Rabaut	Snyder	Weiss
Ramspeck	Sparkman	Wene
Randolph	Spence	West
Rankin	Starnes, Ala.	Whelchel, Ga.
Richards	Steagall	White
Robertson	Stefan	Whitten
Robinson, Utah	Stewart	Whittington
Rogers, Calif.	Stockman	Wickersham
Rowan	Sullivan	Winstead
Sadowski	Tarver	Woodrum, Va.
Sasser	Thomason	Worley
Satterfield	Vincent, Ky.	Wright
Sauthoff	Voorhis, Calif.	Zimmerman
Sikes	Walter	
Smith, Va.	Ward	

NAYS—187

Allen, Ill.	Gearhart	Miller, Mo.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gerlach	Miller, Pa.
Anderson, Calif.	Gifford	Mills
Andresen, August H.	Gillette	Monkiewicz
Andrews	Goodwin	Mruk
Angell	Gossett	Mundt
Arends	Graham	Murray, Wis.
Arnold	Grant, Ind.	Norman
Auchincloss	Griffiths	Norrell
Barrett	Gross	O'Brien, Ill.
Beall	Gwynne	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bell	Hale	O'Konski
Bender	Hall	Pittenger
Bennett, Mich.	Leonard W.	Ploesser
Bennett, Mo.	Halleck	Poage
Bishop	Hancock	Poulsen
Blackney	Harness, Ind.	Powers
Bolton	Harris, Ark.	Pracht
Boren	Heldinger	Ramey
Brehm	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Buffett	Hinsaw	Reed, N. Y.
Busbey	Hoffman	Rees, Kans.
Butler	Holmes, Mass.	Rizley
Canfield	Horan	Robison, Ky.
Cannon, Mo.	Howell	Rockwell
Carson, Ohio	Hull	Rodgers, Pa.
Carter	Jeffrey	Rogers, Mass.
Case	Jenkins	Rohrbough
Chenoweth	Jennings	Rolph
Chipfield	Jensen	Rowe
Church	Johnson	Schiffner
Clason	Anton J.	Schuetz
Clevenger	Johnson	Schwabe
Cole, N. Y.	Calvin D.	Shafer
Compton	Johnson, Ind.	Simpson, Ill.
Crawford	Jones	Simpson, Pa.
Curley	Jonkman	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Judd	Smith, Ohio
Day	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Dewey	Kearney	Springer
Dirksen	Keefe	Stearns, N. H.
Disney	Kilday	Stevenson
Ditter	Kinzer	Sumner, Ill.
Dondero	Knutson	Sundstrom
Douglas	Kunkel	Taber
Drewry	Lambertson	Talbot
Dworshak	Landis	Talle
Elliott	Lea	Taylor
Ellis	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Ellison, Md.	LeFevre	Tibbott
Ellsworth	Lewis, Ohio	Towe
Elmer	Ludlow	Troutman
Elston, Ohio	McCowan	Vursell
Engel	McGregor	Wadsworth
Fellows	McLean	Welch, Ohio
Fenton	McWilliams	Welch
Fish	Maas	Wigglesworth
Fisher	Martin, Mass.	Willey
Fulbright	Mason	Wilson
Gamble	May	Winter
Gavin	Morrow	Wolcott
	Michener	Wolverton, N. J.
	Miller, Conn.	Woodruff, Mich.

NOT VOTING—67

Baldwin, N. Y.	Granger	Morrison, N. C.
Barry	Hall	O'Hara
Bates, Mass.	Edwin Arthur	O'Leary
Bloom	Hart	O'Neal
Bradley, Mich.	Hartley	O'Toole
Buckley	Hébert	Phillips
Burgin	Holfield	Phillips
Byrne	Izac	Plumley
Capozzoli	Johnson	Rivers
Cochran	Luther A.	Russell
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Ward	Sabath
Culkin	Kilburn	Scanlon
Durham	King	Scott
Eaton	Kieberg	Sheppard
Fay	Larcade	Sheridan
Fitzpatrick	Lesinski	Short
Fogarty	Luce	Slaughter
Ford	Mansfield, Tex.	Somers, N. Y.
Furlong	Merritt	Stanley
Gallagher	Morrison, La.	Summers, Tex.

Thomas, Tex. Van Zandt Wasielewski
Tolan Vinson, Ga. Wheat
Treadway Vorys, Ohio Wolfenden, Pa.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York against.

Mr. Luther A. Johnson for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Bloom for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Izac for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Scanlon for, with Mr. Cole of Missouri against.

Mr. Tolan for, with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Miss Stanley against.

Mr. Byrne for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Lesinski for, with Mr. Scott against.

General pairs:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wheat.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.

Mr. Cochran with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. King with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Culklin.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 92: On page 70, line 22, strike out the following: "Provided further, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1944 programs of soil building practices and soil and water conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total expenditures of which, including administration, shall not exceed \$300,000,000."

And insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided further, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1944 programs or plans now or hereafter authorized under section 7 or 8, or both, of said act of February 29, 1936, or under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the total expenditures of which including administration, shall not exceed \$300,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 92.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amend-

ments numbered 98 and 99, which relate to the same subject matter, the Federal Crop Insurance Act, be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 98: On page 76, line 17, strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$7,818,748."

Amendment No. 99: On page 76, line 21, strike out the following: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for any other purpose except in connection with the liquidation of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton crops planted prior to July 31, 1943."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments numbered 98 and 99.

Mr. Speaker, this subject matter was very fully discussed in connection with the conference report considered last week, and I do not care to add anything to what I said at that time. If any Member desires to address the House on this subject, I shall be glad to yield him time.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I believe I was the first man to offer a bill in Congress to put into operation crop insurance. Let me tell you why I offered that bill several years ago.

Out of my long experience in farming and in dealing with farmers, I found every year in some section crop failures because of hailstorms, floods, drought, boll-weevil infestation, or something like that. Because of crop failure, for which farmers were not responsible, many of the smaller farmers were put out of business. I felt sure that we could, if given proper time, work out a satisfactory program which would do two things; stop voting relief for those farmers whose crops were destroyed, and, second, continue them as successful farmers.

During the years before we had insurance, what happened? From year to year we would come to Congress and appropriate money purely for the relief for those people, as high as \$60,000,000 in some instances. We have voted millions to take care of that situation. You should look up the relief record, money appropriated by Congress to say nothing about millions spent by the Red Cross for relief because of crop failure.

Besides that, without protection of crop insurance, the class of people we want to help would go out of business on account of those crop losses, and then what happens? Why then you would have them come to the Farm Security Administration, giving them 100-percent loans to buy land, with the hope we may be able to make land owners out of them? It does not make any difference to many of you how many millions we may lose

under the land-purchase program, including grants in a great many instances.

When this program was put into operation it was definitely understood that we would pay the expenses until we were able to work out, on a fair and sound basis, crop insurance, therefore, you should not refer to the expense of this program as losses. You are spending billions for plants and plus-profit contracts, and industry and contractors are not taking any chances, but when it comes to farms, that is different. During the 4 years under the wheat program we have had losses of only \$17,000,000. During the 1 year with cotton we have had losses of about \$4,500,000. Under the 3-year contract with wheat farmers our losses are becoming much smaller, and we want to put cotton on a 3-year basis.

The thing I want to get over to you is this, we should not do this at this time in this great emergency.

I realize there will have to be some revamping of this legislation. That is true with other farm legislation. But I want to ask you seriously, Is this the time to do it? The farmers are up against every type of problem that you can mention right in the midst of the greatest emergency in which we have ever been engaged. If we do not continue this insurance program, we will be simply telling the farmer next year, "You will not have an opportunity to pay a premium for insurance; you must plant your crop and take your chances." If you want to wipe out this program, why not wait until after this emergency? Why not wait until we have had time to work out a sound, satisfactory program? Suppose it would take 10 years, would not it be worth the price? There are other crops that will be taken in as we go along under this program.

There are a number of large farmers in this country who oppose this legislation. They do not take any insurance. Why? Because they are able to take the risk. If they have a short crop, they can double up with fertilizer and everything next year to make good their losses. But millions of small farmers and sharecroppers who could be protected and kept on the farm and off relief, as well as out of the hands of the Farm Security Administration under the rehabilitation and land-purchasing program, will be forced out of their present farm operations. When these small farms lose out, why, those large farms will take them over on their large farms as renters or sharecroppers.

The plea that I make to this House, regardless of the merits or demerits of this program, is not to wipe out this program now in the midst of this great emergency.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, as this bill was reported to the House in the first instance the subcommittee recommended liquidation of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. It provided the necessary funds to meet all commitments for that liquidation. The Senate, however, struck the House language and

proposes now to provide an administrative fund of something in excess of \$7,000,000 to continue the Corporation.

I have repeatedly expressed my objection to carrying on this experiment further, for this reason: We have insured wheat for 4 years. Adding the administrative expense and the losses, we lost \$41,000,000 on wheat. We have insured cotton for 1 year. For that 1 year we lost one and one-third million dollars. The experiment has gone forward far enough. We should not endanger the Treasury now by letting this program run so that flax, fruit, corn, and other commodities will be added, only to increase the losses to the Federal Treasury. Four years is enough as an experiment, so it should be liquidated now. If this were so popular and if millions of farmers were involved, as the gentleman from South Carolina says, why is it that only one out of every three wheat farmers in the country has undertaken in 4 years to take out crop insurance? If this is so popular why is it that only 1 out of every 10 cotton farmers has bothered to take out crop insurance on cotton? The losses are growing larger year after year. Taking the loss, plus the administrative expense, the Treasury was out six and three-quarters millions in 1939; it was out ten and a half million in 1940; it was out \$12,000,000 in 1941, and \$12,000,000 in 1942. That is a sufficient experiment at the expense of the Public Treasury. It should be stopped now. The motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] should be voted down. This was defeated by an overwhelming majority of this House last week. It should be defeated now by an even greater majority, so that we can serve notice on the Senate as to how the House feels about it at the present time.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULMER. I want to state to the gentleman that the total amount stated by the gentleman in every instance included the expenses of the program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I mentioned that.

Mr. FULMER. And the total amount lost over the 4 years is only \$17,000,000. We have voted as high as 50 and 60 million for relief prior to this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The whole story is that the difference between the premiums collected and the indemnity paid was a loss of \$17,000,000 to the Treasury. Then if you add \$24,000,000 for administrative expenses, the United States Treasury, meaning the taxpayer, was out \$41,000,000 on this program. Those facts cannot be controverted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois has stated that this program has thus far cost the Federal Government \$40,000,000. Even this is not out of line with the original understanding. My recollection is that the crop-insurance bill authorized an appropriation of \$100,000,000, and it was clearly understood in the beginning that the Government would defray all adminis-

trative costs which might be incurred by the experiment in the field of all-risk crop insurance. It was likewise clearly understood that the Government would suffer losses as it has suffered in the prosecution of this program. The losses suffered have not been altogether disappointing.

All-risk crop insurance was an experiment. We knew that it was an experiment and we knew that it was an experiment which no private corporation in America could or would undertake. No private corporation was in a position to accumulate the information and the data which of necessity had to be accumulated. Prior to the inauguration of an insurance program the Federal Government and only the Federal Government was in a position to obtain the necessary information and but for the tremendous Agricultural Adjustment Administration set-up which we at that time had in this country, we could never have collected the necessary information.

Congress authorized this experiment and now because forsooth the experiment has not proven to be a grand and a complete success, we are urged to abandon it. Will we go up the hill and down again because in the operation of the cotton program for 1 year we have lost \$1,000,000? As participation in the program increases premium rates decrease. It is hardly reasonable to expect the administrators of this program to develop an actuarially sound program on cotton within the short space of 1 year. The gentleman from Illinois says that they have had 4 years' experience on wheat. Yes; that is true. But we were told in the beginning, and the Congress and the country knew that it would probably take 10 years to work out a sound, businesslike, self-sustaining program for crop insurance.

Practically every other person engaged in various and sundry vocations and avocations of private life can obtain insurance upon their businesses and property, and even upon their talents. Even a chorus girl can insure her voice and a tap dancer can insure her toes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Not at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The chorus girl will pay for it if she does not have some "sugar daddy" to pay for it for her.

Mr. COOLEY. Maybe the chorus girl will have a "sugar daddy" to pay for it for her. The gentleman may be an authority on that but I am not. Neither am I asking Uncle Sam to finance this program forever, but I do insist that it not be liquidated at this time. The gentleman from Detroit objects, but certainly this is not the first thing he has objected to. The crop-insurance program is a very important part of a well-considered and well-rounded farm program.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Which gentleman from Detroit objected?

Mr. COOLEY. I was under the impression that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] was from Detroit. I am sorry if I was in error. Perhaps he

lives outside of Detroit, but at any rate we know that he is from the State of Michigan.

In all earnest, I am looking at this program purely from an unselfish standpoint. As I have said many times, it does not mean anything at all to the people of my district, but if it is continued even they may at some future date be greatly benefited by it. Certainly it means much to many farmers of the Nation at the present time.

It cannot actually be said that we are losing money. The money is not lost. The benefits are paid to distressed farmers and the money goes to farmers who have suffered a loss of 75 percent by reason of crop failure, either on account of pests or drought or floods or some other catastrophe which has befallen them. We have annually spent millions upon millions for relief in distressed agricultural areas.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and also the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] for sponsoring this splendid movement.

Is it not just as important as it is to give war-risk protection to our merchant shipping?

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman's statement. We are now writing war-risk insurance and this is a very hazardous undertaking.

Even if the Government suffers loss by this all-risk crop-insurance program, only farmers in distress are benefitted by it, and I hope that the program may be continued and that the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina will prevail.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, we have discussed this matter of crop insurance until we are thoroughly familiar with the fact that the farmer is the only large producer in this country who does not have an opportunity to secure some form of insurance. In all other cases where we need insurance to take care of a national need the Federal Government has provided it.

I have a \$10,000 United States Government insurance policy that the United States Government issued to me in the last war. On this policy the Government has paid all administrative expenses for 25 years. A great many other Members of this body hold similar policies. And, every man who comes back from this war is going to have Government insurance, and the United States Government will pay every dollar of administrative expenses. You would not come before this House and claim that we are giving these men something they should not have in providing insurance at cost because the United States Government needs these men to fight.

In like manner the United States Government needs the farmers of this country to produce crops and all this amendment does is to give them an opportunity

to produce those crops with some reasonable degree of assurance that they are going to get some little return when the season is over. That they are going to have some little something to show for their work when the season is over. I fear we are not going to get the crops produced which we need unless we can give the farmers a more efficient, a cheaper and a sounder way to protect their crops, and there is no sounder way than to provide some of the administrative expenses to take care of the system of crop insurance whereby our farmers may know that regardless of the season they will at least have something to see for their labor when the season is over.

But it is said that under this program there has not been as much paid in as has been paid out during the last 4 years, and that is perfectly true. But is there a Member of this House who has had any opportunity of observing the organization of any form of insurance company, whether it be life, fire, or casualty, who would expect such an organization has made a profit during the first 4 years?

I want to say that there never has been such an insurance company, fire or life, or old-line insurance of any kind, that could show a profit during the first 4 years.

You know and I know that any sound insurance company always will have a certain period of time in which it does not make a profit.

On the basis of that same reasoning you cannot expect farm insurance, which has never been successfully carried before in the history of the world, to show a profit during the first 4 years. But at the same time we have got to provide some kind of assurance, before the farmers begin to grow their crops, before these men start their production, that when the season is over they are going to have some return at the end of the year, and we have to furnish crop insurance, just as we are giving Government insurance to other businesses and commercial interests in this country to protect them from unexpected losses. We must provide the farmers against unexpected losses in producing their crops if we are to expect these crops to be produced in the quantities we desire.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, assuming that there have been losses sustained by the Government in the last 3 or 4 years in its crop insurance policy, have we stopped to think whether or not the losses sustained have been more than the expenditures would have amounted to had we not had this insurance policy? In other words, it has been the policy of this Government for the last quarter of a century to assist agriculture when large areas of crops have been destroyed by natural causes or causes over which the farmers had no control.

In the last quarter of a century, or the last 25 years, we have expended upwards of a billion dollars aiding those whose crops were lost by drought, hail, storms, floods, hurricanes, or other natural

causes. However, for the last 3 or 4 years the Congress has not spent money to aid farmers for crops that have been lost in that way. The Congress had a group of farmers before it last year and year before last from areas that had suffered untold losses on account of excessive rains, and they asked for \$20,000,000 in one area, and in other areas \$40,000,000 in the way of relief. The Congress said to them: "No, we have now established a policy of insuring crops and we have abandoned the policy of contributing to the support of farmers who have lost their crops by natural causes."

We have saved the amount contributed heretofore in the way of relief, and the amount we have lost on insurance has not been equal to the average annual amount lost on contributions.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that the Crop Insurance Corporation was authorized to enter into 3-year contracts with the wheat growers of the country and that thousands upon thousands of those 3-year contracts have not been completed?

Mr. HARE. I think the gentleman is right, and in fairness, good conscience, and equity the Congress is bound to carry out these contracts.

And if the contracts are abrogated by this vote we take here they will charge we have broken faith with these farmers who entered into the three-year contracts.

And the Government would still be the loser. I think in all fairness and in justice to those who worked out this scheme of insurance, that they should have sufficient time to see whether or not under fair conditions, under normal conditions, it will work. You cannot determine a policy in 1 year, you cannot determine a policy in 2 years; it "takes more than one swallow to make a summer" and it takes more than 2 years or 3 years to determine whether or not this plan of insuring crops can be effectively, efficiently, and economically carried out. I therefore feel it would be inadvisable to discontinue the policy at this time.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. If, as the gentleman states, it takes 3 or 4 years to complete the experiment, how does the gentleman justify the 3-year contracts that were entered into?

Mr. HARE. I understand there has been no loss on those, but you are breaching those contracts on which the time has not expired; in other words, the period for which they were entered into has not expired, yet you are terminating the contracts.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I realize that, but if it is based upon experience which has been gained during a period of years, it does not seem they should have entered into contracts for a period of 3 years not knowing what the results would be.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. FULMER. I may say for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois that they have had less losses on the 3-year contracts than any others.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, no doubt there have been losses in the way of administrative costs, but this was reasonably anticipated for a few years or possibly several years, when Congress enacted the original law. My thought is that within a few years the administrative costs should be reduced to a minimum or to a point where there would be little or no losses over a period of years. There are administrative expenses, or losses if you prefer to call it, in all the Government activities where an effort is made to provide insurance or annuities of any kind.

I have not had an opportunity to make inquiry but I doubt very much whether the premiums paid by our veterans are sufficient to pay losses and administrative expenses. I am quite certain that the deductions from salaries of Government employees are sufficient to pay retirement annuities and all administrative expenses, and that is a program that has been in operation for a period of upward of 20 years and yet no committee has recommended that this policy be abolished. But simply because the farmers have not been able to perfect a program of insurance within 1 or 2 years that will pay all losses and administrative expenses and leave a surplus in the Treasury some Members suddenly become economy-minded and now insist that the whole scheme be abolished. Apparently, some have been recently bitten by the economy bug, because I see some of those opposing this motion stood here 2 months with tears in their eyes pleading for the oppressed income-tax payers and urging that they be forgiven their income taxes for 1942 to the tune of approximately \$3,000,000,000 when more than one-half of that amount had already been paid into the Treasury. Still they insist that ten or fifteen million dollars a year in the way of administrative expenses is too great a burden for the Federal Government to bear in assisting farmers to work such a crop-insurance plan. I agree that probably this is a heavy burden, but when we take into consideration the appropriations made by the Congress for the relief of farmers when crops are destroyed on account of rains, floods, hail, storms, insect pests, and so forth, these amounts sink into insignificance, and in support of this statement and in justification of my argument, I want to quote from the report of the President's Committee on Crop Insurance submitted in House Document No. 150 in the first session of the Seventy-fifth Congress showing expenditures for agricultural relief during the 10-year period ending June 30, 1936, where the amount totaled \$615,937,000.

The report says:

Distressed farmers in 48 States, together with farmers in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska received relief from the net Federal expenditures totaling \$615,937,000 during the 10-year period ending June 30, 1936, as follows:

Alabama.....	\$11,420,000
Arizona.....	3,088,000
Arkansas.....	14,125,000

California	\$11,365,000
Colorado	19,584,000
Connecticut	222,000
Delaware	104,000
Florida	9,446,000
Georgia	13,381,000
Idaho	7,995,000
Illinois	8,698,000
Indiana	4,223,000
Iowa	8,646,000
Kansas	32,102,000
Kentucky	4,302,000
Louisiana	10,013,000
Maine	2,674,000
Maryland	4,007,000
Massachusetts	489,000
Minnesota	31,911,000
Michigan	4,966,000
Mississippi	10,611,000
Missouri	21,903,000
Montana	24,718,000
New Hampshire	609,000
New Jersey	3,693,000
New Mexico	14,744,000
New York	3,451,000
Nebraska	21,739,000
Nevada	2,119,000
North Carolina	11,466,000
North Dakota	63,132,000
Ohio	7,403,000
Oklahoma	19,907,000
Oregon	3,789,000
Pennsylvania	3,691,000
Rhode Island	94,000
South Carolina	11,434,000
South Dakota	53,362,000
Tennessee	6,236,000
Texas	71,803,000
Utah	11,586,000
Vermont	741,000
Virginia	6,890,000
Washington	5,363,000
West Virginia	5,386,000
Wisconsin	12,463,000
Wyoming	10,560,000
Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Alaska	4,043,000
District of Columbia	245,000
Total	615,937,000

Mr. Speaker, these contributions were made by the Federal Government to farmers for losses sustained on account of rains, floods, storms, hurricanes, and so forth, over a period of 10 years without insurance. If this 10-year period was representative of other 10-year periods it would pay the losses and administrative expenses under the crop-insurance program for more than 20 years. Now which is the cheaper to the Federal Government, the crop-insurance program or the crop-relief program?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, one of the best arguments I ever heard made for crop insurance is implicit in an episode in real life on a plantation in Hale County, Ala. One of the best Negro farmers in that county came to see the owner of the plantation to get his "advances" agreed on for Christmas and the next year. As soon as the mission had been revealed, the owner said: "Why, Charlie, we just had our settlement for this year two weeks ago. You had paid your account in full and had \$700 coming to you. I paid you that and suggested that you put it in the bank. You said you were going to do so. You didn't owe a cent in the world,

and ought to have \$700 in the bank. That's more money than I have. Why borrow money to run on next year, on which you'll have to pay interest, when you have your home, your mules, your cows, your chickens, meat, and everything else you need and more money than you could possibly need to finance your farming operations all next year? What's become of your money?" Charlie replied: "It's still in the bank, Captain. That's where it's going to stay. You don't think I'm fool enough to risk my own money on next year's crops, do you?"

That is exactly why we need crop insurance, because no one who knows the perils of farming would take the risk if he could avoid it. No one farmer can be sure of a crop. He must run the risks of drought, floods, excessive rains, pests, and other contingencies. But a hundred thousand farmers can each be sure of an average crop if they could pool their interests and their efforts on widely separated tracts, so that good and bad weather and infestation of pests may be averaged. That is the simple reason for crop insurance. The spread of the coverage makes the insurance safe and takes the gamble out of the occupation. No farmer nor group of farmers can do the insuring. The Government can, and without risk of loss over a period of years if a sufficient number are insured to obtain the necessary spread of coverage. The Cotton Belt over, or the Wheat Belt over, or the Corn Belt over, the risks will be equalized, spread, and three-fourths of an average crop may be safely guaranteed. A small premium, in kind, will pay the losses and the expense of operation.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has faith in the sound venture of crop insurance. Its action is in disagreement with ours. This is now the only thing which separates us from a finished enactment. Every other segment of the Nation's interest has been taken care of except agriculture. We are begging of you to do this not in any sense as a gratuity—it is not—but because it is a sound business proposition. It will cost you \$2 for every one you save if you scuttle this ship. You have been paying out forty, fifty, or sixty million dollars a year in crop-failure gratuities. We are asking you to continue this experiment in the soundest of all institutions, insurance; give it a chance to prove itself and save money while you are so doing.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Does not the gentleman believe, if it is a sound proposition, that private insurance companies would have taken it up a long time ago?

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly not; because as long as Congress deals out gratuities no sufficient number of farmers can be expected to insure their crops at their own expense. No private institution can charge a premium for doing what the Government gives gratuitously. If, however, we stick to our guns and prove by our continued support of our insti-

tution of crop insurance, through the test period of 10 years, that we mean business, and will not supply the dole, then private insurance companies would be glad to insure crops just as cheerfully as they now insure lives, health, and property.

Crop insurance is actuarially sound. It will prove a safe business activity if we support it during its infancy. It can be made self-sustaining, or even profitable. Let us give it a fair chance. Let us not kill our own child!

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some misapprehension on the part of those who have spoken in favor of this amendment. One of them referred to "the leadership on the other side." The truth about the matter is that the leadership in opposition to this amendment is from this side of the aisle. Every member of the subcommittee on the agricultural appropriation bill originally reporting this bill and constituting the conference committee submitting this conference report, both majority and minority Members, after hearing the representatives of the Crop Insurance Administration and all others interested and sifting the evidence and the statistics, decided unanimously—without a dissenting vote at any stage of the proceedings—that crop insurance ought to be abolished. And now an amendment is offered from the floor seeking to overturn the carefully considered judgment of those who have given more study to the subject than anyone else here this afternoon, and its proponents are endeavoring to sustain their position by charging that the leadership in opposition to their unofficial amendment comes from the other side of the aisle.

Let me repeat, that every member of the subcommittee which heard and studied the cost and results of crop insurance, both Democrats and Republicans, has consistently opposed continuation of this ill-starred activity.

And for a very good reason, Mr. Speaker. The United States Treasury has taken an awful beating on crop insurance, and is in for a still worse beating in the years ahead if it is continued. I realize it is popular to turn to the United States Treasury on every occasion for every deficit in order to cover up the errors and mistakes in every utopian failure. It is a simple and popular remedy. Just pay it out of the Treasury. It is perfectly all right to take any amount out of the United States Treasury at any time. And that has worked for the time being. But the war and the heavy demand for revenue to support the war have awakened the country to the effect of these unwarranted drafts on the public funds. The people are at last becoming Treasury conscious. And all the more these last few weeks since we have raised taxes and since taxpayers have made their second quarterly payment

and have begun to get the reaction from the pay-as-you-go plan.

This House may not be interested, but the taxpayers will be interested to learn that the cost of this Dean Swiftian project exceeds the cost of any of these relief projects in relation to benefits derived. It costs the Government \$2 for every dollar paid the farmer. The losses are stupendous and continuous. No private company would consider such absurd ratios. It is the most uneconomic, unbusinesslike, impractical proposition ever seriously suggested even in Government finance, and it grows steadily worse.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Speaking of it from an economical standpoint, under the report of the President's committee, Document 150 of the First Session of the Seventy-fifth Congress, it is reported there in table IV that for the 10-year period ending June 30, 1933, the Federal Government had spent \$615,937,000 for farm relief in the way I have referred to already. This would carry the insurance that we now have in force for a peak of 15 years without costing the farmer 1 cent.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That has nothing in the world to do with the proposal before us. It does not have the slightest relation from any point of view. And if you really want to consider it as a relief project why not give the money directly to the farmer and thereby save half of the cost to the Government?

But still more surprising—the farmers themselves do not want crop insurance. We have been given the impression by some of these ardent advocates of continuing crop insurance that the farmer will pine away if he can get insurance. What do the reports of the Crop Insurance Corporation itself show? They show that notwithstanding the efforts of the employees of the Department to recruit patrons and sell insurance, the number taking insurance steadily dwindles from year to year. The farmers do not want it. They are not taking it. Those who have taken it are discontinuing it notwithstanding the efforts of the Department to retain them as clients. Outside of the employees of the Department who will lose their jobs if crop insurance is discontinued and a few here on the floor, who from that point of view are serving the employees rather than the farmer, there is no demand for this huge expenditure.

And regardless of whom those advocating this amendment represent, they do not represent the taxpayers. I challenge you to stop any taxpayer on the street or on the farm and ask him about saddling this heavy burden on the Treasury. The farmers do not want it. The taxpayers do not want it. The members of the committee which has studied the project do not want it. And I trust the Members will show by their vote that the House does not want it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULMER) there were—ayes 82, noes 142.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Thirty-four Members have risen, not a sufficient number.

So the yeas and nays were refused.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. TARVER, a motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions in connection with the conference report was laid on the table.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments that are still in disagreement and agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and that conferees be appointed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Speaker appointed the following conferees: Messrs. TARVER, CANNON of Missouri, SHEPPARD, WENE, LAMBERTSON, DIRKSEN, and PLUMLEY.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 275), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, etc., That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill H. R. 2714, with Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table; that the House further insists on disagreement to the Senate amendments and agrees to the further conference requested by the Senate.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 275, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House consider the resolution?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 229, noes 21.

So, two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the House agreed to consider the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take it that every Member knows what this resolution calls for. It permits the taking from the Speaker's table the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 2714), with the Senate amendments thereto, in complying with the Senate request for a further conference. The resolution provides that the House should further insist on disagreement to the Senate amendments.

Objection on the part of the gentleman from New York to granting the Senate request for a further conference makes this resolution necessary. I was appealed to only about 20 minutes ago to call a meeting of the Rules Committee for the reporting out of this resolution.

I complied not because I have been in favor of the House further insisting on disagreeing with the Senate amendments.

Notwithstanding the overwhelming vote of the House, I am of the opinion that the House has acted unwisely in the matter of this disagreement in denying to appropriate for the salaries of three Government employees alleged to have been guilty of un-American activities. I am satisfied that in the near future, when prejudice will no longer prevail, these three gentlemen, none of whom I have ever met—Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, Dr. Goodwin B. Watson, and Dr. William E. Dodd, Jr.—will be found to be loyal, patriotic, and sincere American citizens.

I am indeed gratified that each of these three men is of old American stock, and certainly they have the right under the Bill of Rights and the Constitution to express their views in opposition to the Nazi-Fascist influences in our country, as they have done, and that is all they are actually guilty of.

On careful investigation and sane examination of the activities of these men, in the days to come, the prejudice that has been created against them will be found to have been entirely unfair and unjustifiable and that they have only acted within their rights and in the interests of our country under the Bill of Rights and the Constitution.

I regret exceedingly that the conditions prevailing at this particular time have impelled me to take this action in bringing this resolution before the House.

In all the years of my service I have never felt as regretful of my action as I do at this particular time, and I hope the Senate will remain steadfast in the position it has taken. My action was prompted by the necessity for preventing delay in payment of the salaries of over 400,000 Government employees.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up any more time. I yield to the gentleman from New York the same amount of time I have consumed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this rule is reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules. As one Member of the House objected to sending the urgent deficiency appropriation bill to conference, it was necessary for the Committee on Rules to bring in a rule in order to expedite consideration of the bill and get it to conference as speedily as possible. This rule is brought in to expedite consideration of the bill because we have almost reached the last day of our fiscal year, which will be tomorrow. I am surprised that anyone, particularly my distinguished colleague from New York, should have objected, because this bill carries the salaries of some 400,000 civil-service employees, and if it does not go through either tonight or tomorrow morning there will be wailing and gnashing of teeth.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Certainly I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. First of all, the gentleman knows that those salaries can be protected by a continuing resolution. Second, the unanimous-consent request that was submitted by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] provided that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments. I say that the Senate amendments take out of this bill a matter which is not only extraneous but unconstitutional. The responsibility for holding up those salaries rests on you.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman refers to an amendment upon which this House has passed almost unanimously two or three times. The rule simply provides that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments and send the bill to conference. The amendments in question are Senate amendments numbered 5 and 60, amendment No. 5 relating to the President's control over the emergency funds with certain limitations upon them and No. 60 is the so-called subversive salary amendment affecting the pay of three gentlemen on the Government pay roll, Messrs. Watson, Dodd, and Lovett. I hope the rule will be adopted unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, although I have taken only 2 minutes, I have agreed to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. I think he will not take the whole 3 minutes. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

TIME TO QUIT FOOLIN'—APPOINT HOOVER

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Congress should end—and end now—the indecision, the hesitancy, the vacillation, which are typical of this administration.

Even though, prior to the war, the President's experiments were certain to bring us national bankruptcy, the temporary destruction of individual opportunity and the American way of life as our forefathers had known it, all hope of recovery was not obliterated.

But, with the coming of the war, the President's egotism, his refusal to delegate tasks and authority to men of known ability and independence, are characteristics which must be counteracted if the war is to be won, the welfare of our people and our national existence preserved.

The history of this administration from its inception down to the present moment is one of crisis following crisis, emergency succeeding emergency, each manufactured and each used as an excuse for the grasping of additional power, the expenditure of additional billions.

The President has met every simulated emergency by the creation of a board or a commission or the appointment of some so-called czar. Boards, commissions, and czars have followed each other in rapid succession. Patriotic, self-sacrificing, independent men, each of whom had demonstrated his ability in his particular field, have been

called to Washington by the President, each in turn having been assured that he would have opportunity to correct some glaring fault in our national economy or Government, and each—with but one exception—has found himself unable to perform the task allotted him because he has been denied the authority to follow his own judgment; because he has been hampered by the quarreling and bickering among the President's little would-be dictators.

The one exception is Jeffers, who, when the bureaucrats attempted to hamstring him, asserted himself and has brought order out of the confusion in the rubber program.

The stumbling block over which competent executives, called to aid in the solution of our problems, have tripped and fallen is the President's egotism; his firm conviction that he is indispensable; a superman, possessed of a master mind. Never was an individual more mistaken.

Chester Davis, like others who preceded him, like some who are still in Washington, is a man of ability. Left alone, given authority, the chances are that he would have solved the problem given him. But Chester Davis has gone the way of all those men of energy, of demonstrated capabilities, and he is out.

Another man, a man of admirable character; a man we all admire and respect, Marvin Jones, our former colleague, will now step up and be sacrificed on the altar of the President's self-assurance.

It is time to quit "foolin'." Congress should take charge. The President played politics with the labor situation until it threatened serious impairment of our war efforts. Then, goaded by the people, the Congress acted.

The food problem is, or soon will become, as serious, or for that matter, more serious, than was the labor problem. Again, the President is playing politics, toying with the idea of subsidies, of drawing upon the general tax fund to appease certain pressure groups.

Again Congress should assert itself. Congress should create the office of director of production, processing, transportation, and distribution of food. It should give the director the power to solve the food problems, free from interference by the Chief Executive or any of his subordinates.

Congress should name as that director a man of unquestioned patriotism, who has demonstrated his ability to solve the problem. That man is Herbert Hoover.

Before any recess or any adjournment, we should assure the country, by legislation of that character, that we mean to do our part to enable the people to do their part on the home front, insofar as feeding our civilian population, our armed forces, and the forces of our allies is concerned.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, believing that those opposed to any proposal in the House should have the right to be heard, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, my objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] was not made in a spirit

of obstruction or for the purpose of holding up legislation in this House. I objected for the reasons I stated when the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] had the floor, that the request of the gentleman from Missouri and the motion which we are now considering directs the House conferees to further insist upon the House disagreement with the Senate amendments.

One of the Senate amendments eliminates that provision which prohibits the payment of salaries to three individuals now on the Government pay roll, Messrs. Dodd, Watson, and Lovett. Those of us who oppose this provision certainly could not permit the unanimous-consent request to be granted without objection, nor can we support this motion. As we have never had any opportunity to vote on a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, I feel that this is an opportunity to express ourselves again on this issue particularly because events since this prohibition was inserted in the bill emphasize all the more the reasons to eliminate it.

Since the House took the position it did we have had a decision from the United States Supreme Court in the case of William Schneider against the United States dealing with the basic issue involved here. I wish you would read the decision in that case.

I read some very pertinent portions of this historic ruling of the Supreme Court:

The constitutional fathers, fresh from a revolution, did not forge a political strait-jacket for the generations to come. Instead, they wrote article V, and the first amendment, guaranteeing freedom of thought, soon followed. Article V contains procedural provisions for constitutional change by amendment without any present limitation whatsoever except that no State may be deprived of equal representation in the Senate without its consent (cf. *National Prohibition Cases* (253 U. S. 350)).

This provision and the many important and far-reaching changes made in the Constitution since 1787 refute the idea that attachment to any particular provision or provisions is essential, or that one who advocates radical changes is necessarily not attached to the Constitution (*United States v. Rovin* (12 F. (2d) 942, 944-945)).

As Justice Holmes said, "Surely it cannot show lack of attachment to the principles of the Constitution that [one] thinks it can be improved" (*United States v. Schwimmer*, supra (dissent)).

Criticism of and the sincerity of desires to improve the Constitution should not be judged by conformity to prevailing thought, because "if there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other, it is the principle of free thought—not free thought for those who agree with us, but freedom for the thought that we hate." (Id. See also Chief Justice Hughes, dissenting in *United States v. Macintosh*, supra, p. 635.)

Whatever attitude we may individually hold toward persons and organizations that believe in or advocate extensive changes in our existing order, it should be our desire and concern at all times to uphold the right of free discussion and free thinking to which we as a people claim primary attachment. To neglect this duty in a proceeding in which we are called upon to judge whether a particular individual has failed to manifest attachment to the Constitution would be ironical indeed.

I submit that attachment to the Constitution is the only requisite for employment in government.

And again, in the same majority opinion the Supreme Court said:

"With regard to the constitutional changes he desired, petitioner testified that he believed in the nationalization of the means of production and exchange with compensation, and the preservation and utilization of our 'democratic structure—as far as possible for the advantage of the working classes.' He stated that the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' to him meant 'not a government, but a state of things' in which 'the majority of the people shall really direct their own destinies and use the instrument of the state for these truly democratic ends.' None of this is necessarily incompatible with the 'general political philosophy' of the Constitution as outlined above by the Government. It is true that the fifth amendment protects private property, even against taking for public use without compensation. But throughout our history many sincere people whose attachment to the general constitutional scheme cannot be doubted have, for various and even divergent reasons, urged differing degrees of governmental ownership and control of natural resources, basic means of production, and banks and the media of exchange, either with or without compensation. And something once regarded as a species of private property was abolished without compensating the owners when the institution of slavery was forbidden. Can it be said that the author of the Emancipation Proclamation and the supporters of the thirteenth amendment were not attached to the Constitution? We conclude that lack of attachment to the Constitution is not shown on the basis of the changes which petitioner testified he desired in the Constitution.

You are here legislating out of office three men whose only crime has been that of being anti-Fascist. They belonged to organizations that were engaged in what? They were engaged in aiding republican Spain, in aiding China, and in fighting fascism. I say there is not an American soldier today who would not get on his knees and thank God if we had aided China and had not sent scrap iron and oil to Japan, or if we had aided Loyalist republican Spain, which would have been in this war on our side, instead of abetting a Franco Fascist Spain which is doing the work of our Axis enemies, or if we had stood up collectively with other nations against fascism and nazi-ism instead of having given our blessing to a policy of appeasement at Munich and its consequent strengthening of Hitler and his satellites.

You have not only adopted a precedent which is contrary to every concept of democracy but you have also acted in violation of the Constitution. You have invaded the power of the Executive to appoint. You are now saying to the Executive whom he may appoint and whom he may not appoint. You have distorted the Constitution.

Further, the preponderant majority of the press has been condemning your action editorially all over the country. Here you are, holding up the salaries of thousands of Government employees simply because you insist on carrying on a witch hunt against men whose attitude and whose conduct has been 100

percent anti-Fascist, and you who insist on this disgraceful action, must take the responsibility for holding up the salaries of thousands of employees. It is your insistence on an undemocratic, unconstitutional, and irrelevant provision in an appropriation bill which will cause hardship to so many faithful Government employees. I also ask you, Why do you not pass a continuing resolution so that these people may be paid?

I say that a vote against this motion at this time will serve notice that the House does not insist on the position that it took—a position which is contrary to the fundamental concepts of democracy, and, what is more, not in keeping with the anti-Fascist character of this war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 205 and noes 22.

So the resolution was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER.

FEDERAL AID IN CONSTRUCTION OF RURAL POST ROADS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that two additional conferees be appointed for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2798), to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes", approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. MOTT.

The Clerk will notify the Senate.

INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 139, consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, this is simply a renewal of the oil pact that the House has renewed on several other occasions?

Mr. BOREN. This is the fifth time that the House has taken this action.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. BOREN. It is a unanimous report both from the Petroleum Committee and the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to an extension and renewal for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1943, of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas, executed in the city of Dallas, Tex., the 16th day of February 1935, by the representatives of Oklahoma, Texas, California, and New Mexico, and thereafter recommended for ratification by the representatives of the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, and Michigan, and subsequently ratified by the States of New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Illinois, Colorado, and Texas, which said compact was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such compact was, by the President, presented to the Congress and the Congress gave consent to such compact by House Joint Resolution 407, approved August 27, 1935 (Public Res. No. 64, 74th Cong.), and which said compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 2 years from September 1, 1937, by an agreement executed in New Orleans, La., the 10th day of May 1937, by the representatives of the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, and New Mexico, and was duly ratified by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, New Mexico, Illinois, and Colorado, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President, presented to the Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by Senate Joint Resolution 183, approved August 10, 1937 (Public Res. No. 57, 75th Cong.), and which said compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 2 years from September 1, 1939, by an agreement duly executed and ratified by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, and Michigan, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President, presented to the Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by House Joint Resolution 329, approved July 20, 1939 (Public Res. No. 31, 76th Cong.), and which said compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 2 years from September 1, 1941, by an agreement duly executed and ratified by the States of Texas, Oklahoma, California, Kansas, and New Mexico, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President, presented to Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by House Joint Resolution 228, approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 246, 77th Cong.).

The extended and renewed compact dated the 1st day of April 1943, duly executed by the representatives of the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Kentucky, and which extended and renewed compact has been deposited in the Department of State of the United States, reads as follows:

AN AGREEMENT TO EXTEND THE INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

Whereas, on the 16th day of February 1935, in the city of Dallas, Texas, there was executed "An Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas" which was thereafter formally ratified and approved by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, Colorado,

and Kansas, the original of which is now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a true copy of which follows:

"AN INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS"

"Article I"

"This agreement may become effective within any compacting State at any time as prescribed by that State, and shall become effective within those States ratifying it whenever any three of the States of Texas, Oklahoma, California, Kansas, and New Mexico have ratified and Congress has given its consent. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto as hereinafter provided.

"Article II"

"The purpose of this compact is to conserve oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause.

"Article III"

"Each State bound hereby agrees that within a reasonable time it will enact laws, or if laws have been enacted, then it agrees to continue the same in force, to accomplish within reasonable limits the prevention of:

"(a) The operation of any oil well within an inefficient gas-oil ratio.

"(b) The drowning with water of any stratum capable of producing oil or gas, or both oil and gas in paying quantities.

"(c) The avoidable escape into the open air of the wasteful burning of gas from a natural gas well.

"(d) The creation of unnecessary fire hazards.

"(e) The drilling, equipping, locating, spacing, or operating of a well or wells so as to bring about physical waste of oil or gas in the ultimate recovery thereof.

"(f) The inefficient, excessive or improper use of the reservoir energy in producing any well.

"The enumeration of the foregoing subjects shall not limit the scope of the authority of any state.

"Article IV"

"Each State bound hereby agrees that it will, within a reasonable time, enact statutes, or if such statutes have been enacted then that it will continue the same in force, providing in effect that oil produced in violation of its valid oil and/or gas conservation statutes or any valid rule, order or regulation promulgated thereunder, shall be denied access to commerce; and providing for stringent penalties for the waste of either oil or gas.

"Article V"

"It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations.

"Article VI"

"Each State joining herein shall appoint one representative to a commission hereby constituted and designated as

"THE INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT COMMISSION, the duty of which said Commission shall be to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about conservation and the prevention of physical waste of oil and gas, and at such intervals as said Commission deems beneficial it shall report its findings and recommendations to the several States for adoption or rejection.

"The Commission shall have power to recommend the coordination of the exercise of the police powers of the several States

within their several jurisdictions to promote the maximum ultimate recovery from the petroleum reserves of said States, and to recommend measures for the maximum ultimate recovery of oil and gas. Said Commission shall organize and adopt suitable rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"No action shall be taken by the Commission except: (1) By the affirmative votes of the majority of the whole number of the compacting States represented at any meeting, and (2) By a concurring vote of a majority in interest of the compacting States at said meeting, such interest to be determined as follows: Such vote of each State shall be in the decimal proportion fixed by the ratio of its daily average production during the preceding calendar half-year to the daily average production of the compacting States during said period.

"Article VII"

"No State by joining herein, shall become financially obligated to any other State, nor shall the breach of the terms hereof by any State subject such State to financial responsibility to the other States joining herein.

"Article VIII"

"This compact shall expire September 1, 1937. But any State joining herein may, upon 60 days' notice, withdraw herefrom.

"The representatives of the signatory States have signed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States, and a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

"This compact shall become effective when ratified and approved as provided in article 1. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto by affixing its signature to a counterpart to be similarly deposited, certified, and ratified.

"Done in the city of Dallas, Tex., this 16th day of February 1935.

"Whereas said interstate compact was heretofore duly renewed and extended for 2 years from September 1, 1937, its original expiration date, to September 1, 1939; and

"Whereas said interstate compact was again duly renewed and extended for 2 years from September 1, 1939, its second expiration date, to September 1, 1941; and

"Whereas said interstate compact was again duly renewed and extended for 2 years from September 1, 1941, its third expiration date, to September 1, 1943; and

"Whereas it is desired to again extend and renew said interstate compact to conserve oil and gas for another period of 4 years from September 1, 1943, its present expiration date, to September 1, 1947: Now, therefore, this writing witnesseth:

"It is hereby agreed that the said compact entitled 'An Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas' executed in the city of Dallas, Tex., on the 16th day of February 1935, and now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a correct copy of which appears above, be and the same hereby is, extended for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1943, its present date of expiration, this agreement to become effective within those States joining herein when executed by any three of the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, Arkansas, Louisiana, Kentucky, and New Mexico, and consent thereto is given by Congress.

"The signatory States executed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States and a duly certified copy thereof shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

"Executed as of this the 1st day of April 1943, by the several undersigned States, at their several capitols, through their proper officials thereunder duly authorized by

statutes, resolutions, or proclamations of the several States."

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of section 1 is hereby expressly reserved.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein the leading editorial from the New York Times of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BECKWORTH was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech made by Gen. C. S. Adams.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SABATH and Mr. DIRKSEN were granted permission to revise and extend their own remarks.)

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made and to include excerpts from the decision of the United States Supreme Court.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HON. MARVIN JONES

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Judge Marvin Jones has been appointed by the President as Food Administrator to take the place of Mr. Chester Davis. Judge Jones was general chairman of the

so-called United Nations Food Conference held at Hot Springs, Va. As I have pointed out heretofore, that assemblage was composed almost entirely of devotees of the planning cult, that its primary purpose was not the consideration of food but the planning of a new world order along communistic lines and a superstate to rule it.

It will be interesting now to observe what part Judge Jones will play in this movement as food administrator of the United States. How and to what extent will he use the highly strategic position he now holds to regiment our American farmers as well as our whole population in accordance with the underlying schemes of the world planners?

Will Judge Jones use his high position to intensify the present New Deal controls and interferences in agriculture that already have our farming population in a state of virtual slavery? Will he also inaugurate more direct measures for communizing agriculture in the United States? Should it be surprising to anyone if he should use the high office to which he has been appointed to carry out these ends, knowing that he presided over the Hot Springs conclave where the Russian delegation was given top position and which by his actions he heartily approved?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GRANT of Alabama was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the appendix of the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? There was no objection.

CALL OF CALENDAR WEDNESDAY DISPENSED WITH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted the following conference report and statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) "making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment Numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5, and agree to the same; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this Act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other Act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Junior, and Robert Morris Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom." And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 61.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate amendments numbered 5, 60, and 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 5: The original House bill carries provision extending until June 30, 1944, the unexpended balance in the President's emergency fund on June 30, 1943. To this provision the House added a prohibition on the use of the fund for making allocations to the National Resources Planning Board and the Farm Security Administration. The Senate struck out this provision and inserted language of a general character restricting the use of the fund. The House adopted the Senate proposed language modified so as to make exemptions for the Army, Navy, State Department, and Office of Strategic Services but left the Senate language applicable to all other Federal agencies. The Senate accepted the House modification of the Senate language but added a further exception for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The conference agreement omits the original House amendment relating to the National Resources Planning Board and the Farm Security Administration, but retains the proposed Senate language as modified by the House, and later modified by the Senate, to except the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

No. 60: The House bill, by section 304, contains a prohibition on the use of any Federal funds, after the date of the enactment of the bill, for continuing in Federal employment Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morris Lovett. The Senate struck out this section. The conference agreement restores the section modified so as to prohibit the use of Federal funds for their employment after November 15, 1943, unless such persons, prior to that date, have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

No. 61: Corrects a section number; the amendment is reported in disagreement. The House managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment correcting the section number and inserting a paragraph to make appropriations in the bill, or portions of appropriations, available for obligation in the fiscal year 1944, retroactive to July 1, 1943.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 40 minutes.

WAR PRODUCTION COST

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the War Department Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, whose duties are to originate, draft, and steer through the House and defend in conference the War Department appropriation bills, is constituted of seven members of whom I am one.

This places upon me a direct responsibility not only for appropriating War Department moneys but to see that this money is well spent. I have tried to discharge that duty to the best of my ability. In April 1942 I determined to study production costs in our defense plants manufacturing War Department material and equipment.

I was determined to learn just why a medium tank which weighs 30 tons costs \$90,000. Why a 105-mm. gun on two wheels costs \$21,000 and \$83,000 on a self-propelling mount, and why a Springfield rifle was costing us \$60 each when a commercial rifle costs much less. I was determined to learn just why material was costing us what it does cost. The costs given are those furnished by the War Department to the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. They include spare parts, testing costs, freight, and other charges up to the time these weapons are delivered at some place in the United States, where they can be turned over to the fighting forces.

AUTHORITY FOR VISITING PLANTS

In November 1942 I asked the Under Secretary of War for a letter of authority authorizing me, as a member of this subcommittee, to go into any defense plant in the United States, inspect the plant and records, take copies of production records and costs, and see just what they were doing with the money our committee was appropriating for this Department. After some delay and some hesitation, I received the letter from the Under Secretary of War.

Maj. Gen. Levin Campbell, Chief of Ordnance, immediately gave me letters to every ordnance plant to which I wanted to go. This officer from the beginning gave me all the assistance he could, taking the position that "if there is anything wrong we want to know it. If we can improve methods, we want to do so. If you can help us to become more efficient, we will appreciate your help." I want to express my appreciation.

I also wish to express my appreciation for the sympathetic help given me by both the gentleman from Missouri, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative BUELL SNYDER, chairman of the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. They assured me they would give me all the support I needed and do anything in their power to correct any matter that needed correcting in the production program.

I approached the factory management in the spirit of cooperation. My approach was something like this: "My name is ENGEL. I am a Member of Congress, representing the Ninth District of Michigan. I am here to have you educate me so I can do a better job in spending your money. I have a right to ask and shall expect your fullest cooperation. I want facts, just facts."

I started my trip January 29, 1943, and spent 44 days inspecting 47 plants. I

spent 2 weeks in General Motors, Chrysler, and Ford's. I received on the whole splendid cooperation from everyone for which I am profoundly grateful. I saw the factories convert raw ore and scrap into everything from a rifle barrel to a 16-inch gun ready to go into action.

WHAT WAS FOUND

Production: No one who has studied the problems, as I have tried to study them, can spend 44 days going through plants and seeing the wheels of production roll without coming to the conclusion:

First. That on the whole we are doing a magnificent job of production;

Second. That labor, as a whole, has worked faithfully and well and that labor is entitled to a full share of the credit for such production; and

Third. That the conversion of peacetime plants into war production plants has been the most amazing chapter in the industrial history of the world and both to management and labor, from the head of the production plants on down to the lowest-paid worker, must go great credit.

After having visited the 47 production plants, I spent a day at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds with a group headed by the Chief of Ordnance. I watched them operate various types of equipment and saw them fire everything from a carbine up to an 8-inch gun, with competent officers explaining the effectiveness and the wartime use of each piece of equipment.

With another group I spent several more days in going through the Signal Corps establishment at Monmouth, N. J.; the Chemical Warfare plant at Edgewood Arsenal; and the engineering cantonment at Fort Belvoir, Va.

We saw demonstrations of chemical warfare equipment, the firing of various types of weapons; we saw demonstrations of radar, the latest equipment of the Signal Corps; and ended the trip by examining engineering equipment at Fort Belvoir and watching the demonstration of an engineering battalion taking a beachhead under simulated artillery, machine-gun, and airplane attacks. No one can see this demonstration without becoming impressed with the fact that we do have the most modern and effective war equipment in the world.

It gives one confidence and faith in the armed forces and great credit must go to the leadership of Maj. Gen. Levin Campbell, chief of ordnance; Maj. Gen. T. J. Hayes, in charge of production; and Maj. Gen. G. M. Barnes, in charge of research and the development of new products and who is undoubtedly one of the outstanding ordnance experts in the world.

COSTS

Before I go into detail and discuss the question of costs, I want to make these observations: First, the appropriations required by war agencies have been so great they are incomprehensible to the average citizen. Many reasons can and

will be given for such costs. I shall point out repeatedly items where costs are excessive.

However, the principal reason why, in my judgment, such prohibitive costs have been possible is that the administration, and those representing the administration, have continually measured all progress in war production by the amount of money or the number of dollars spent.

The public is informed that we are spending three, four, or five billion dollars, or more a month and the public takes it for granted that because we are spending large sums of money that we are making great progress. This not only discourages economy but actually encourages waste. The more a department or service can spend, the more credit it is given for having made progress in war production. It is this fact, I believe, more than any other, that is responsible for the tremendous costs in our war program.

Measuring of progress in production by the number of dollars spent should be stopped. We should measure that progress by telling the public frankly how many planes, how many tanks, how many guns, and how much equipment of various types we are making. Fear of having the enemy know these facts is no longer a reason for not doing so.

THE TAXPAYER EVENTUALLY PAYS PAY-ROLL COSTS AND CORPORATION PROFITS

I have taken the position that the extent to which a corporation is engaged in government business in wartime, that corporation's pay roll is a Government pay roll because it is the taxpayer who actually meets that pay roll. I have taken the position that the extent to which that corporation is engaged in war production, to that extent the profits are being paid by the taxpayer and the taxpayer has a right to know the facts, both as to pay roll and profits.

CORPORATION PROFITS

I believe in the capitalistic form of government. I believe in the profit system. I believe that a company engaged in any type of business, whether public or private, is entitled to a reasonable profit, sufficient to set aside a surplus to act as a cushion against another depression. It should be allowed to set aside money for reconversion to peacetime industry. On the other hand, I do not believe that any company is entitled to excess profits. No corporation should be permitted to take 20 percent profit when that profit is paid for by taxpayers whose tax exemptions have been brought down as low as \$500 and by bond buyers who are receiving a low rate of interest on the money they are lending to the Government.

I believe in decent wages. I believe in skilled labor being paid and paid well. You have in war industries many skilled men, toolmakers, diemakers, and others. I was fascinated as I watched these men work. It takes years to make an expert diemaker.

Should the worker who operates a simple machine that he can learn to operate in 2 or 3 weeks be paid as much, or more, than the skilled craftsmen who built the die which makes it possible for the workman to turn out his work? That is the issue that I wish to present to this House and let no one misquote me or misunderstand me. I repeat—I believe in good wages, I believe in decent profits. I am opposed to excess profits. I am also opposed to giving the unskilled worker the pay of the skilled worker who is compelled to serve an apprenticeship of years before he is entitled to the wages of a master workman.

EXCERPTS FROM PLANT NOTES

I took notes as I walked through the various plants with the superintendent, foremen, and others. Before I retired at night, I would rewrite the notes and write down my impressions on a portable typewriter. I want to give you a few excerpts from the notes I took. It will give you some idea of the impression the trip left on my mind. I am hoping that by doing so I can best give you the same kind of an impression.

I walked through a plant with the superintendent. I pointed to a young girl welding and the following conversation took place:

Question. How old is that girl?

Answer. Eighteen years old.

Question. Where did she come from?

Answer. Kresge's Dime Store, selling ribbons.

Question. How much does she make?

Answer. Sixty-five dollars a week.

This is pay at the rate of \$3,380 a year. The base pay of a major in the Army is \$3,000. Other girls still work at the ribbon counter for \$18 a week and pay income taxes to help the Government pay this girl \$65 a week.

Question. How much experience does she have to have?

Answer. From 2 to 6 weeks.

In driving out of a town I passed a mile and a half of automobiles—workers going to a 7:30 a. m. shift at a war production plant. I visited the bank cashiers in surrounding towns of 1,000 people or more from the area in which these people live. I interviewed the cashiers with a result something like this:

Question. Who are these people working in the factories?

Answer. They are farmer boys, gas-station attendants, grocery-store clerks, drygoods-store clerks, former automobile salesmen, etc.

Question. Do you cash their checks in your bank?

Answer. Yes.

Question. How much do they make?

Answer. Anywhere from \$120 to \$220 every 2 weeks.

Question. Do they have any special skill?

Answer. H—I, no. They were hauling manure last fall, digging potatoes, husking corn, pumping gas, selling groceries, drygoods, etc.

Farmer boys are making more money in a factory in 1 year than the farm is worth upon which their father has been trying to pay a mortgage for a lifetime.

I go through a Government arsenal. The superintendent informed me he is being paid \$6,500 a year after 38 years of

service. A defense plant offered his \$4,000-a-year assistant foreman, \$6,500, plus a \$5,000 bonus, or \$11,500 a year.

The base pay of Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff; Gen. Douglas MacArthur, commanding the Pacific Area; Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, commanding the allied forces in Africa; Gen. H. H. Arnold, Chief of the United States Army, is \$10,200.

Tank welders in other factories, after 4 weeks of training, are being paid \$67 a week. Girls in still another plant, after 2 to 3 weeks of training are earning as much as \$269.72 a month for a 48-hour week. This is pay at the rate of \$3,236 a year. Other girls receive \$146 for 2 weeks for work assembling oil pumps. This is pay at the rate of \$3,800 a year. The base pay of a lieutenant colonel in the Army is \$3,500, while the base pay of a colonel in the Army is \$4,000 a year.

Thousands of other girls in the country are being paid \$18, \$20, and \$25 a week, with income tax exemptions lowered to \$500 and paying taxes and buying bonds so their good sisters with no more training can be paid \$65 to \$75 a week. Machine-gun assemblers are being paid from \$4,700 to \$8,740 a year. The base pay of Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell is \$8,500 a year. He is in command of the entire supply system of the Army from tanks and 16-inch guns down to pistols. He has control of billions of dollars worth of contracts. He is charged with the responsibility of spending billions upon billions of dollars in clothing, feeding, transporting, and equipping the Army upon the battlefields of the world. His base pay is \$8,500 a year, or \$240 less than some machine-gun assemblers assembling a .50 caliber machine gun.

Soldiers and sailors at Bataan, Pearl Harbor, Tunisia, Bizerte, on battleships, cruisers, destroyers, submarines, on airplane bombers, all have to learn not only to take down and assemble these same machine guns blindfolded, but have to learn to operate them. Some of them get as little as \$50 a month.

When they come back they will have to pay an income tax the rest of their lives to pay back the money we borrowed so these factory machine-gun assemblers can be paid from \$4,700 to \$8,740 a year.

I am wondering what will happen when they do come back. The Government pays \$55.80 a week in pay and per diem to girls while learning to mend shoes. The same Government pays \$50 a month to the young men in the service who are wearing those shoes.

There are two factories in the same city owned by the same company and both engaged in war production: The first is paying an average of 99 cents an hour, the second \$1.42 an hour. The workers in the first factory average earnings of \$2,115 a year while the workers in the second factory average earnings of \$3,650 a year.

Can we wonder why there are labor troubles and why the strikes?

A farmer came to my office in the interest of the Farm Security Administration pleading for more credit for the farmer. He told me of a neighbor's boy who is working in a defense plant and who had

spent the Sunday before at his home. The young man had two kicks: The first, prices were too high; and the second, he was losing \$32 because he had not been able to work that Sunday. Millions of workers in America are still working for low wages, some for pre-war wages which have not kept pace with skyrocketing costs of living.

SUMMARY AND OVER-ALL PICTURE ON COMPANIES WHOSE PLANTS I VISITED

Factory pay rolls of the companies whose plants I visited and whose reports I was able to obtain, including General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, and General Electric, excluding Government arsenals, show an aggregate total pay roll for the year 1942 of \$2,316,041,747. The total number of employees working in these plants aggregated 850,522. Their average annual earning for the year 1942 was \$2,725. The total number of man-hours worked for the year was 1,706,484,931. The average amount paid for each hour actually worked was \$1.35. While factories were on a 48-hour basis, in most instances lay-offs because of lack of material, absenteeism, sick leave, vacation leave, and other causes, brought the actual number of hours worked down to an average of 38.6 hours for each week for the year.

I was not able to obtain the total number of stockholders in all of the companies surveyed but it is interesting to note that the 6 companies, including Chrysler, General Motors, and General Electric, but excluding Ford, have a total of 764,364 stockholders. It is my judgment that the entire group of corporations surveyed have more than 800,000 stockholders with an average of 850,522 employees. These companies have nearly as many stockholders as they have employees. Corporations, after all, are just aggregations of individuals.

SURVEY OF GOVERNMENT ARSENALS

Five Government arsenals located in four States in the eastern half of the United States show an aggregate pay roll for 1942 of \$108,474,270. These arsenals had an average number of 50,464 employees during the year 1942 while the average earnings per employee during the year 1942 was approximately \$2,130.

DETAILED INFORMATION AND FACTS

In addition to the general facts in the summary above given, I submit herewith detailed facts taken from pay rolls and earnings given me by plant superintendents or taken from the records.

At first I did not expect to use the company name; however, for fear that the statement might be questioned and to give an opportunity for correcting errors, if there are errors, I shall give the name of each company.

At the General Motors Fisher tank plant welders train 4 to 6 weeks, and now make \$67 per 48-hour week with a base pay of \$1.29 per hour.

At the Diesel plant, at Detroit, women 18 years old and up earn as high as \$269.72 per month for a 48-hour week, on jobs that I was told took them from 2 to 3 weeks to learn. Toolmakers in 1942 were making from \$525 to \$625 per

month. Operational valve grinders made \$293 per month, and I was told it took from 6 to 8 weeks to learn this job. Sweepers earned \$200 to \$210 per month.

I asked employers for a table showing the three men who had the highest earnings for the year 1942 and the three men who had the lowest earnings in each craft. I also asked for the same information for the month of December 1942, with the following results:

Springfield Armory: Drop forgers showed earnings per employee during the year 1942 ranging from \$3,370 to \$4,858. Barrel straighteners from \$2,540 to \$4,169. Barrel riflers from \$2,567 to \$3,940. Carpenters from \$2,515 to \$3,111. Die sinkers from \$3,771 to \$4,906. Electricians from \$2,458 to \$3,597. Operational machine grinders from \$2,352 to \$2,916. Operational machine punch press from \$1,902 to \$2,895. Toolmakers from \$3,455 to \$4,103.

Rock Island Arsenal machinists were paid from \$39.20 to \$65.57 per week. Laborer, classified, from \$24.40 to \$37.71. Toolmakers from \$42 to \$69.60. Machine operators, lathe, from \$37.60 to \$62.64. Machine operator, driller, from \$28 to \$46.40 and tool designers from \$44.24 to \$62.50. The highest paid men in the Rock Island Arsenal were, first, drop forgers. Their wages ranged from \$3,370 to \$4,858 per year. Second highest, barrel straighteners whose wages ranged from \$2,540 to \$4,169. Third highest, barrel riflers, whose wages ranged from \$2,567 to \$3,940. I have many more items, but this will give an idea of what the pay is at Government arsenals.

Colts Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co.: The highest paid labor I found was in the plants of this company. This company, I was informed, attempted, through the War Labor Board, to readjust its wages trying to bring up the lower paid group and reducing the higher paid group, but I was informed, was unsuccessful.

I am including a copy of their report to me of the annual earnings of the highest and lowest paid employees in the group known as machine-gun assemblers who are assembling .50 caliber machine guns, machine gun filers, and others. Out of the 25 machine-gun assemblers in this high-low group, 5 earned in 1942 from \$8,000 to \$8,741; 7 earned from \$7,000 to \$8,000; 7 more earned from \$6,000 to \$7,000; 4 earned from \$5,000 to \$6,000, and out of the 25 only two earned less than \$5,000 during 1942, 1 who earned \$4,959.72, and 1 earned \$4,788. Twelve out of the 25 received more than \$7,000 and 22 out of the 25 earned more than \$6,000, all in 1942. These men assembled .50 caliber machine guns after they are manufactured, each one assembled a certain part of the gun. The average number of hours worked per employee in 1942 was 47.9.

The \$8,741 a year paid to the highest paid of these machine-gun assemblers is \$241 a year more than the base pay of Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, the Chief of the Service of Supply of the entire United States Army, who is charged with the responsibility of procuring and fur-

nishing and supplying on every front in the world what we are told will be an army of 11,000,000 men with clothes, food, fighting equipment, ammunition, and so forth.

Think of paying a machine-gun assembler \$241 a year more than the base pay of Lieutenant General Stillwell, who commands the armed forces in the Chinese theater.

Is there anyone in or out of labor circles who can look those facts in the face and justify them?

Is there anyone in this country of ours who has a son in the service who can look that son in the eye and defend pay rolls such as these when, in the final analysis, the money to meet these pay rolls has to be borrowed and will ultimately have to be paid in taxes by that son, should he be fortunate enough to come back from the war?

I am wondering just what these 11,000,000 men will say when they are discharged from the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps and resume their places in civilian life.

I am inserting in the RECORD exhibit A, which gives the facts on .50-caliber machine-gun assemblers. It shows the amount that employees earned, straight earnings, overtime, other bonuses and total earnings for the years 1941 and 1942. I have left the names of the employees blank.

If anyone would like to have the names of any particular case shown there, I shall be glad to furnish the name of the employee so he can check it back.

The total earnings for these 25 employees for the year 1941 was \$87,017.64. These same employees earned in 1942, \$171,915.32, or approximately twice the

amount they earned in 1941. Their straight earnings in 1941 were \$71,926.47 and in 1942, \$134,775.52. Overtime in 1941 was \$10,854.94 and in 1942 overtime was \$28,674.25. Other bonuses in 1941 were \$4,236.23 and in 1942, \$8,465.55.

Machine-gun filers: The record shows that of the 44 .50-caliber machine-gun filers in the Colts Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co., 2 were paid \$8,000 to \$8,230; five between \$7,000 and \$8,000; 10 between \$6,000 and \$7,000; 18 between \$5,000 and \$6,000; 6 between \$4,500 and \$5,000 and 2 between \$4,200 and \$4,500; and 1 of the 44 was paid \$2,928. Out of the 44 only 9 made less than \$5,000 during that year.

I am also enclosing the break-down of the pay roll of these 44 men. This break-down shows that the aggregated total earnings in 1941 was \$155,858.34 and in 1942 these same men earned \$260,503.62. Their straight earnings for the year 1941 were \$129,727.32, while their straight earnings for 1942 were \$201,275.84. Their overtime earnings in 1941 were \$19,500 and in 1942, \$44,020. Other bonuses paid them in 1941 were \$6,630 and in 1942, \$15,207.

In case after case these people earned more than twice as much in 1942 as they earned in 1941 and then we talk about inflation. These are not isolated cases as you will find similar cases in other companies. Let us take some of these facts into consideration when we talk of inflation, roll-back of prices and subsidies.

Jack & Heintz, Inc.: I was only able to obtain the factory pay-roll break-down on this plant for the last 3 months of 1942—for October, November, and December:

	October	November	December	Total
Straight time wages.....	\$829,273.12	\$912,244.45	\$1,029,969.60	\$2,771,487.56
Overtime premiums.....	195,553.70	252,589.31	248,465.96	696,608.97
Night shift premiums.....	32,277.46	39,295.40	44,481.27	116,054.13
October production bonus.....	117,000.00			117,000.00
Christmas bonus.....			944,300.00	944,300.00
Total.....	1,174,104.28	1,204,129.16	2,267,217.22	4,645,450.66

This factory pay roll shows that for the 3 months of the total pay roll \$4,645,450, \$2,771,487 was straight pay while \$1,873,963 was overtime, and other premiums and bonuses included \$944,300 Christmas bonuses. The total number of man-hours for the 3 months was 2,497,135. The average pay was \$1.86 per hour. The average number of employees for the 3 months was 3,593. The average employee received for the 3 months \$1,293, or an average of \$431 per month, or at the rate of an average annual earning of \$5,172. This pay for 3 months is broken down as straight wages \$773, bonuses paid \$520, including \$260 Christmas bonus, per employee.

Continental Motors Corporation—Muskegon, Mich., plant: The average number of employees that this plant employed during 1942 was 4,470. The total wages paid for the year was \$14,135,000. This shows that the average earnings per employee at this plant for the year 1942 was \$3,162. The total number of hours

actually worked was 9,903,865, which brought the average hourly earnings to approximately \$1.42 an hour.

Let me emphasize again that factory pay rolls which are incurred in the production of war material which is being paid for by taxes and bonds are not confidential and to the extent that these pay rolls are incurred in war production, they are public pay rolls and the public is entitled to have the facts.

I asked for and obtained the three highest and the three lowest paid employees for each classification for the year 1942. This record shows as follows: The workers in the crankshaft department were paid from \$3,643 to \$3,915 for the year; flywheel workers were paid from \$3,489 to \$4,258, men engaged in shipping motors received from \$3,148 to \$4,536. The motor test department employees were paid from \$3,300 to \$4,318; handscrew machine operators were paid from \$3,633 to \$4,983. Out of nine workers representing the

three highest and the three lowest in this department, only one worker received less than \$4,100 and only three workers received less than \$4,500. Two elevator operators were paid \$3,277 and \$3,165. Automatic screw machine operators earned from \$4,380 to \$5,185. Punch press operators received from \$3,860 to \$4,957; carpenters were paid from \$3,468 to \$3,984, while electricians were paid from \$3,918 to \$4,529. Janitors were paid from \$2,850 to \$3,196 for the year, while toolroom workers were paid from \$3,671 to \$5,906 for the year 1942. Welders received from \$3,862 to \$4,267. Tool designers were paid \$4,963 to \$7,299. Aircraft assemblers were paid from \$4,047 to \$4,881. Aircraft testers were paid from \$4,202 to \$4,795. Engineers were paid from \$3,114 to \$4,579. The highest janitor was paid more than the lowest paid engineer. These are the amounts actually paid these employees during the year 1942.

I also asked for the monthly earnings for these employees for December 1942, showing the actual earnings for the 40-hour week, plus bonuses for overtime, and so forth. This factory was on a three-shift basis, so outside of the tool room and one or two other departments there would be comparatively little overtime beyond the 48-hour week. There are a number of cases where the amount of bonus paid exceeds the 40-hour earnings. For instance, December earnings of one stock chaser was given as \$201.48 straight time, while his overtime bonus was \$283.56, making total earnings for the month of \$485.04. In the experimental department one man received for the month of December \$239 and \$215 for overtime, making a total of \$454 for the month. In the service stock department one man's actual earnings were \$405, of which approximately \$196 was straight time and \$208 was overtime.

I also have a break-down of the machine-shop department's pay roll for the 2-week period ending December 13, 1942. Total of hours worked for the 2-week period was 109,652. Total bonus hours worked, 17,827. Total hours paid, 127,480. The regular earnings were \$67,718.30, while the bonus earnings were \$90,267.92, and the total earnings for this department for the 2 weeks were \$157,986.22. In department after department the bonuses exceeded the regular earnings for the same period.

The machine-assemblers department for the same 2-week period ending December 13, 1942, showed the total hours worked was 225,993. The total hours paid was 282,403. The bonus hours were 56,412. The regular earnings were \$123,624.33. The bonus earnings in this department were \$283,548.05, or more than twice the regular earnings, while the total earnings were \$407,172.38. Here are departments whose bonus earnings were twice the amount of the regular earnings. A summary of the entire payroll department for that same month was: Total hours worked, 580,799; bonus hours, 126,041; total hours paid for, 706,841. The total earnings of these employees for this 2-week period were \$896,184, of which the regular earnings were \$487,316, and the bonus earnings were

\$408,978. The bonus earnings were almost as large as the regular earnings.

NORGE REFRIGERATOR CO. AND NORGE PRODUCTS CO., DIVISION OF THE BORG-WARNER CORPORATION

Norge Refrigeration Division: This company employed before the war somewhere between 3,000 and 4,000 people. The average number of employees in 1942 was 1,018. Dividing the total pay roll by the number of hours worked, we find that employees were paid on an average of 99.8 cents an hour, they averaged \$40.58 per week and \$2,113 per year. The three top men earned in a sample week \$69.34, \$49.64, and \$40.21.

Norge Products Co.: This company was running full force only during the last 5 months of 1942—from August to December. When we take the total pay roll including bonus, overtime, and so forth, and divide it by the number of hours worked and the number of employees, we find that these employees earned on an average of \$1,521 during the 5 months, or \$304 a month, or at the rate of \$3,648 per year. The average pay per hour was \$1.42. The highest paid individuals received \$106.49 per week in the toolroom while machine operators earned \$88.07 per week. These people received time and a half for overtime, 5 cents an hour additional for night work after 2:30 p. m., 2½ percent vacation bonus, and those who were not on piece work received 20 percent over the base rate until piece work was introduced. Bonuses were running as high as 50 to 60 percent.

Despite repeated appeals by me to the War Department that business be placed in the old plant, despite repeated promises, the old plant in 1942 instead of having 3,500 employees had an average of only 1,018 employees. The Government went out, rebuilt another plant, at public expense, operated by another corporation, the Norge Products Co., which is also a subsidiary of Borg-Warner and employed 795 people in the second plant while the first plant remained two-thirds idle.

In the old plant the average pay per hour was 99.8 cents; in the new plant \$1.42. In the old plant the average annual pay was \$2,113; in the new plant they were paid for 5 months at an annual average rate of \$3,648. The wages paid throughout the new plant are from 50 to 75 percent higher than in the old plant. Both plants are subsidiaries of Borg-Warner and are located 2 miles apart. The manager informed me, as did the Government inspector, that unskilled men could earn from \$60 to \$80 per week in the new plant for 40 to 45 hours' work by operating a one-purpose machine after a 3 weeks' learning period. I saw one individual whom I recognized. He was a businessman in town. He locked his place of business, went to the factory with apparently no experience, and was paid, at the end of a few weeks, \$67.42 for 1 week of 45 hours.

GIRLS PAID \$55.80 PER WEEK TO LEARN TO MEND SHOES

At Fort Devens, Mass., an Army post, the Government advertised for girls to learn to repair shoes. They advertised that they would pay \$55.80 a week. Upon

writing to the Civil Service Commission and the Army officials, I was informed that these girls worked 48 hours a week and were paid for 52 hours, at 40 cents an hour. This gave them in wages \$20.80 a week. In addition to this, they were paid \$35 a week for living expenses while taking the training. The Government was actually paying these girls \$55.80 a week to learn how to repair shoes while the soldiers in the service who wore these same shoes were being paid as low as \$50 a month.

FOURTH, FIFTH, AND SIXTH GRADERS CERTIFIED FOR \$1,560-A-YEAR JOBS

Dr. Leonard Carmichael, president of Tufts College, of Boston, and a director of the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel, which was organized under the Civil Service Commission by an Executive order and transferred to the War Manpower Commission, testified before the Labor-Federal Security Agency subcommittee recently.

Dr. Carmichael testified that the Civil Service Commission had certified for this National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel, Washington domestic servants, some of whom had not passed the fourth, fifth, or sixth grades and whose entire work experience had been only in domestic service. They certified these people for filing clerks, machine typists, and punch-card-machine operators. The salary was \$1,260, plus \$300 increase, or a total salary of \$1,560 a year. He further testified that they had to separate certain individuals from the pay roll, "but, as you know, it is quite a process to separate one person from the service."

CONCLUSION

A number of years ago Congress passed the Walsh-Healey Act to protect labor and to assure that on public contracts labor would be paid the wage rate that prevailed in the community in which the manufacturing was being done. Mme. Perkins, Secretary of Labor, has filed with each of these plants a wage rate which is supposed to set forth the prevailing wage rate in the area in which the contract is given at the time the contract was let.

When I asked about the prevailing wage rate, I was told it was obsolete; that it was not being considered and in every case the wages paid were far beyond that prevailing wage set by the Secretary of Labor in the community in which the contract was let.

Nonwar plants and nonwar labor have been hard hit in the face of these facts. A system of labor piracy was testified to by Chairman McNutt before our committee and which brought about the orders to freeze wages far beyond the prevailing wage in a certain area. A new company coming into a locality with Government contracts set the price of wages so high that other local companies could not compete and the best labor left them and went to the new company.

Millions of workers in the country in nonwar, but essential activities are frozen by Executive order at pre-war or nearly pre-war wages.

On the other hand, we see millions of others whose wages are far in excess of the prevailing wage, sometimes double

that prevailing wage, also frozen. We find on the one hand, as shown herein, machine gun assemblers being paid a wage rate in 1942 which ran as high as \$8,741 a year. On the other hand, we attempt to freeze a half million coal miners at wage rates that give them annual earnings of from \$1,200 to \$1,700 a year. These miners see young people with little, if any, skill working in factories and in some cases earn from two to four times the annual wages that they are being paid.

While I do not condone wartime strikes, I have a great deal of sympathy for these half million coal miners without whose work the factories of the country cannot produce. They are, I believe, entitled to a pay which will enable them to support themselves and

their families in comfort and which will keep pace with the ever increased costs of living.

The wage earner who has been faithful and who has worked hard and continued to accept his pre-war wage rate without striking is being penalized by being frozen in his job at the wage rate for the duration of the war.

While the wage earner who has continued to insist upon increased wages, who has struck or has threatened to strike for increased wages, or who has benefited from a system of labor piracy, is being frozen at a wage rate that is sometimes two or three times that of the first-mentioned employee.

Mr. Speaker, this problem is as old as the world itself. There is a tradition that at the building of King Solomon's temple,

a group of workmen killed a great master builder because he refused to make it possible for them to obtain master wages to which they were not entitled. This great master builder solved that problem at its inception at the cost of his life. It will take great courage now as it did then to bring about a solution of this and other problems confronting our Nation today. It is extremely doubtful whether the master workman at the other end of the avenue has that courage. It is extremely doubtful whether his personal ambition will permit him to bring about a solution of these problems at the cost of his political life. I am fearful that if these problems are not solved, he will find his country in ruins at his feet and he himself go down in history as its destroyer.

EXHIBIT A.—50 caliber machine-gun assemblers

[Taken from Colts Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co. pay roll for 1941 and 1942]

Employee	1941				1942			
	Straight earnings	Overtime	Bonuses	Total	Straight earnings	Overtime	Bonuses	Total
Name blank.....	\$3,102.43	\$529.92	\$217.29	\$3,849.64	\$3,740.46	\$849.92	\$360.34	\$4,950.72
Do.....	3,257.72	543.54	219.96	4,021.22	6,617.95	1,529.01	389.22	8,536.18
Do.....	2,929.71	446.02	128.91	3,504.64	5,262.32	1,192.54	343.71	6,798.57
Do.....	2,709.29	371.47	121.04	3,201.80	4,689.26	887.38	316.79	5,893.43
Do.....	2,892.31	451.95	234.58	3,578.84	5,846.84	1,338.96	342.43	7,528.23
Do.....	3,143.72	523.61	124.62	3,791.95	5,958.37	1,295.79	377.19	7,631.35
Do.....	2,005.70	272.12	91.89	2,369.71	4,235.98	832.78	229.49	5,298.25
Do.....	2,970.32	409.43	208.45	3,588.20	6,551.89	1,388.48	346.36	8,286.73
Do.....	2,816.35	379.84	185.66	3,381.85	5,438.24	1,085.04	325.46	6,848.74
Do.....	2,632.16	339.11	148.47	3,119.74	4,766.19	959.70	302.74	6,028.63
Do.....	2,693.13	373.71	131.85	3,198.69	5,377.51	1,105.36	313.04	6,795.91
Do.....	3,128.64	485.66	163.21	3,777.51	6,846.67	1,523.63	370.94	8,741.24
Do.....	2,944.23	461.97	214.13	3,620.33	5,692.98	1,115.69	247.56	7,156.23
Do.....	3,010.53	473.22	107.76	3,591.51	4,451.31	926.88	355.89	5,734.08
Do.....	2,934.55	436.85	145.17	3,516.57	6,080.68	1,294.72	346.01	7,721.41
Do.....	2,769.89	354.59	181.39	3,305.87	4,769.38	937.79	320.35	6,027.52
Do.....	3,284.58	554.85	204.30	4,043.73	6,516.00	1,470.49	392.23	8,379.32
Do.....	3,200.84	525.00	165.27	3,891.11	6,285.34	1,393.59	386.92	8,065.85
Do.....	2,894.61	420.47	232.22	3,547.30	5,488.53	1,200.53	332.19	7,021.25
Do.....	3,154.06	526.94	245.25	3,926.25	5,925.45	1,341.23	374.67	7,641.25
Do.....	3,008.24	505.28	109.32	3,622.84	4,832.65	1,063.19	339.88	6,235.02
Do.....	2,650.16	403.85	129.68	3,183.69	4,196.86	920.69	315.40	5,432.95
Do.....	2,969.61	295.13	185.08	3,450.82	3,908.33	596.88	273.67	4,778.88
Do.....	2,770.40	413.60	163.16	3,347.16	6,209.21	1,433.68	329.37	7,972.26
Do.....	2,623.29	355.91	177.57	3,156.77	5,086.22	990.30	304.80	6,381.32
Total.....	71,926.47	10,854.94	4,236.23	87,017.64	134,775.52	28,674.25	8,465.55	171,915.32

EXHIBIT B.—50-caliber machine-gun fliers

[Taken from Colts Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co. pay roll for 1941 and 1942]

Employee	1941				1942			
	Straight earnings	Overtime	Bonuses	Total	Straight earnings	Overtime	Bonuses	Total
Name blank.....	\$2,811.52	\$379.52	\$212.79	\$3,403.83	\$5,747.59	\$1,122.64	\$326.50	\$7,196.73
Do.....	2,885.67	442.53	202.62	3,530.82	5,951.88	1,305.09	340.63	7,597.60
Do.....	3,030.66	467.91	225.47	3,724.04	4,600.78	897.40	354.84	5,753.02
Do.....	3,062.80	496.29	199.81	3,758.90	5,487.05	1,121.04	261.96	6,970.05
Do.....	2,891.05	432.46	169.70	3,493.21	4,360.29	862.22	337.85	5,560.36
Do.....	2,721.17	415.70	219.53	3,356.40	3,717.89	790.57	317.92	4,826.38
Do.....	3,317.48	533.87	224.72	4,076.07	4,407.79	632.26	389.96	5,730.01
Do.....	1,846.79	218.73	171.75	2,237.27	2,289.29	429.86	209.02	2,928.17
Do.....	3,155.72	486.95	205.71	3,798.38	3,896.77	855.99	368.66	5,124.42
Do.....	2,895.82	402.07	219.32	3,517.21	4,367.54	941.42	337.49	5,646.45
Do.....	3,051.20	474.07	187.93	3,713.20	4,239.29	692.26	358.66	5,290.21
Do.....	3,172.51	474.04	228.68	3,875.23	4,519.06	913.89	372.79	5,805.74
Do.....	3,110.87	486.16	222.68	3,820.71	4,802.65	1,009.36	365.34	6,277.35
Do.....	3,106.31	478.50	307.39	4,112.20	4,610.45	965.15	366.05	5,941.65
Do.....	3,026.76	451.41	161.66	3,639.83	4,934.42	1,285.33	352.40	6,572.15
Do.....	2,681.16	339.46	177.81	3,198.43	3,572.60	632.60	308.75	4,514.25
Do.....	3,054.07	459.46	221.20	3,734.73	6,277.82	1,366.09	360.47	8,004.38
Do.....	3,204.18	477.12	208.72	3,890.02	4,583.91	975.17	374.74	5,933.82
Do.....	3,004.28	443.29	170.38	3,617.95	4,352.18	1,154.05	353.67	5,859.90
Do.....	3,019.79	480.04	223.72	3,723.55	5,160.12	1,013.23	354.19	6,527.54
Do.....	3,238.45	496.38	150.87	3,885.70	5,293.49	1,236.80	381.94	6,912.23
Do.....	3,000.21	434.57	166.26	3,601.04	3,983.95	977.79	348.82	5,310.56
Do.....	3,026.55	469.20	146.21	3,641.96	4,605.23	1,201.14	256.62	6,162.99
Do.....	2,569.97	388.01	102.76	3,060.74	3,215.71	681.41	203.63	4,200.75
Do.....	3,160.98	484.81	130.48	3,776.27	5,545.32	1,195.22	363.79	7,104.33
Do.....	2,720.35	410.28	139.50	3,270.13	4,076.78	956.04	317.89	5,350.81
Do.....	2,974.69	439.86	114.07	3,528.62	3,853.32	719.18	248.50	4,821.00
Do.....	2,926.67	451.80	133.98	3,512.45	4,227.39	905.88	343.45	5,476.72
Do.....	3,021.07	425.08	117.99	3,564.14	6,083.34	1,173.64	352.82	7,609.80
Do.....	3,072.79	470.26	121.95	3,665.00	5,127.86	1,279.04	362.25	6,770.05
Do.....	3,167.60	493.20	75.96	3,736.76	6,137.16	1,331.63	377.07	7,845.86

EXHIBIT B.—50-caliber machine-gun fliers—Continued

Employee	1941				1942			
	Straight earnings	Overtime	Bonuses	Total	Straight earnings	Overtime	Bonuses	Total
Name blank.....	\$3,260.81	\$509.67	\$69.63	\$3,870.11	\$5,306.65	\$1,149.85	\$384.96	\$6,841.46
Do.....	2,740.88	418.07	81.93	3,240.88	3,762.47	875.17	320.60	4,958.24
Do.....	2,600.68	364.94	75.57	3,041.19	3,049.75	781.01	301.66	4,932.42
Do.....	2,923.65	439.40	82.27	3,445.32	4,174.03	831.19	345.37	5,350.59
Do.....	3,205.49	496.28	86.41	3,788.18	6,465.40	1,387.59	377.92	8,230.92
Do.....	2,901.83	451.55	81.38	3,434.76	3,227.04	848.82	337.14	4,413.00
Do.....	3,061.72	462.68	77.92	3,602.32	4,337.22	1,057.01	358.91	5,753.14
Do.....	2,765.59	403.70	73.94	3,243.23	4,012.52	866.74	323.69	5,202.95
Do.....	2,733.30	416.79	63.05	3,213.14	4,288.89	941.98	323.20	5,554.07
Do.....	3,075.00	515.05	70.64	3,660.69	4,732.54	1,081.31	366.90	6,180.75
Do.....	2,785.38	399.06	137.98	3,319.42	4,462.84	1,057.08	323.62	5,843.54
Do.....	3,145.65	526.67	130.87	3,803.19	5,082.27	1,190.85	376.83	6,649.95
Do.....	2,598.10	349.77	137.27	3,085.14	3,554.00	724.23	298.09	4,576.32
Total.....	129,727.32	19,500.66	6,630.36	155,858.34	201,275.84	44,020.12	15,207.66	260,503.62

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. First, I think the gentleman should be complimented for the information he has presented to the House on the question he is discussing, and I hope the Members of the House who are not present will read his speech.

I was interested particularly in the matter he referred to, the Colts Manufacturing Co. particularly, since I know something about that company.

I have wondered why the management has not made some effort through the War Department or otherwise to cut down some of the high wages that have been referred to and bring up the level of some of the lower-paid employees.

Mr. ENGEL. I was informed that they tried to reclassify these wages by bringing down the higher and bringing up the lower levels. However, I think the gentleman, in order to get an answer to that question, will have to go to the War Labor Board.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is a matter for the War Labor Board.

Mr. ENGEL. The War Labor Board; yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have been very much interested in this exposé of unwarranted defense-plant wages as brought before the House by the gentleman from Michigan.

Does not the gentleman feel that in all this talk we have had about roll-back on butter and meat prices that really the roll-back should apply to these defense-plant wages?

Mr. ENGEL. I have some very definite ideas on that subject and I expect to discuss the question of inflation sometime later.

I do feel that the roll-back or any policy cannot be effective as long as we allow the doubling up of wage income in 1 year over the preceding year. Butter and meat represent farm labor and farm investment. When you roll back butter and meat prices you in effect roll back farm labor or wages. If you roll back farm wages, why not defense-plant wages?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I think the RECORD should show that the gentleman's colleagues who are on the subcommittee of appropriations for the War Department and on the Appropriation Committee have had a very deep appreciation for the work the gentleman has been doing.

The gentleman from Minnesota has properly taken cognizance of the significance of what the gentleman is saying.

The gentleman from Michigan has pursued this study of costs in war production under handicaps that would have discouraged many of us. Not only has he arranged with others so he could take the 44 days that were necessary through the spring and winter to do this work, but I think most of us know that during the pursuit of the studies he incurred an automobile accident that would have stopped most men, but before the doctor thought he should be out, he set out again, went back to the job, a one-man crusade, and resumed his diligent work and studies of the costs, at first hand, in the war-production plants throughout the country.

I hope that the Members of the House who are not present will take the opportunity to read the gentleman's remarks.

A short time ago he made a statement on the floor, which statement had very wide press notice.

The studies that the gentleman has been making and the conclusions that he is now presenting of the cost of war production throughout the country is deserving of equally good press and I hope that the gentleman of the press will do all they can to call attention to the conclusions that the gentleman is making.

Mr. ENGEL. I want to thank the gentleman from South Dakota for his kind remarks, and also for the support that I have had from my subcommittee, of which the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota is a member. I owe a great deal to my colleagues of both the subcommittee and the full committee. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] as well as the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] have been very cooperative. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] have

done outstanding work on that subcommittee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am in receipt of a labor paper from my district called Greater Los Angeles Labor in which they quote certain Government statistics to show that the labor employed in the defense industries, numbering something close to half a million have received increases in wages averaging 72.4 percent over the same period of time in which the cost of living has increased 25.2 percent which shows a net gain in real wages of 37.7 percent. I believe the figures the gentleman has obtained are far in excess of those I have just quoted and I think it is a great contribution to the whole question.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Has the gentleman found in his investigations any instances of the employment of more people than necessary?

Mr. ENGEL. I found this situation: A plant may have orders enough to run two or three shifts. Reduced orders from the Army may require the plant to reduce from three shifts to two shifts. They may retain that labor so that in case they go back to three shifts, or from one to two, the labor will be available. I went into one plant, for instance, where they were loading shells and where they were working at only 40 percent of the rated capacity. At that plant they kept additional people on the pay roll because they did not know at what moment they might have orders to increase to 50 or 60 percent of their capacity.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I wonder whether these high wages and extravagant practices the gentleman has revealed to us has not had a deleterious effect upon farm production in this country. The gentleman mentioned the case of the repairing of shoes where girls were paid an hourly wage which brought them within the purview of the War Labor Board through a set wage, but he stated also that they received a per diem bonus which was in excess of their weekly wage. I wonder if it would not be possible for us to take

action against such bonuses, which are clearly outside the realm of our ability to regulate, yet which throw our whole production methods out of gear.

Mr. ENGEL. I personally feel that they do not have to pay that type of wage. I believe these people will work and work faithfully without such a wage being paid, but once having paid it, once they have received it, it is hard to give it up. The administration has scrambled the eggs and now finds it impossible to unscramble them.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2996. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SNYDER, STARNES of Alabama, KERR, MAHON, POWERS, ENGEL, and CASE.

THE FULBRIGHT RESOLUTION

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I have the honor of being a member, has recently approved unanimously and is now seeking an early rule on the so-called Fulbright resolution, with which most Members of the House are already familiar.

In form and language it is perhaps one of the simplest resolutions ever to be submitted to this body, but in its purpose and effect is as important and far-reaching as any ever to be considered. It reads in its entirety as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery, with power adequate, to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation of the United States therein.

To those of you who fear that an early consideration of this resolution may precipitate debate and disputes in this body which might prove disastrous in our relations with our allies at this particular time, especially with the joint offensive imminent, may I say that I anticipate little or no contest in the passage of this resolution by the House. It came from our committee with the complete and enthusiastic support of every member thereof, Democrat and Republican alike. As you know, we have some pretty strong dissenters usually in our committee, and when it reports out a measure to the House without a critical voice having been heard, it is a pretty clear indication that that measure will meet with the well-nigh unanimous approval of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

The passage of this resolution will impose upon our country a moral obligation that would insure our active aid in all the multitudinous post-war problems, social, economic, and educational; and in questions of world trade, world transportation, and world armament; but above and beyond all, in the establishment and permanent maintenance of a just and lasting peace. It will circumvent, prevent, and prohibit a repetition of our cowardice after the last war, our failure to live up to our God-given opportunities, duties, and responsibilities, and our attempted selfish retreat into smug isolationism. It will give our allies notice that they may count upon us and our assistance in all these problems, for to date, judging the future in the light of their experience of the past, they do not know what our intentions are, and they may now, together or separately, be formulating policies which will not enure to our advantage.

This resolution has the merit of not bearing the stamp of and not having been inspired by either political party. Nor was it proposed by the administration. It is simply a well-formulated expression of the general opinion and determination of the people of this country. It has been aptly termed a "grass roots" resolution.

And, finally, its passage will lay the cornerstone for a real and well-defined foreign policy for this country, and we have never had a very definite foreign policy save for the good-neighbor policy and the international trade agreements as formulated by Cordell Hull, and the Monroe Doctrine. One important illustration of our lack of foreign policy heretofore is our commitment nearly 50 years ago to defend the Philippines, yet never attempting to acquire by treaty or otherwise the islands and bases absolutely necessary for strategic defense thereof.

A much simpler illustration of our lack of foreign policy is the fact that, almost to the day of Pearl Harbor, we were professing eternal friendship for and an abiding sympathy with China in her desperate and heart-rending struggle with Japan, yet we were furnishing Japan with all the scrap and all the oil and all the munitions she desired with which to crush China, and with which to roll the monsters of modern motorized warfare

over the helpless bodies of her people, and with which to send crashing into her massed population the bombs and high explosives against which these defenseless people had nothing to impose save their naked breasts.

By all means let us begin the formulation of a sensible, definite foreign policy and publish it abroad that all may see that this, the mightiest country on the globe, intends, this war over, to discharge its just duty and responsibility to its own people and to all the world—duties incumbent upon it by very reason of its power and greatness.

Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a short visit home, and while there, I attended the commencement exercises of one of the oldest and best preparatory schools in the South, the Battle Ground Academy at Franklin, Tenn.—its fifty-third commencement, by the way. Twenty-five fine, outstanding teen-age boys, most of them just turning 18, attained their certificates of graduation, and 17 of them had already received their orders of induction into the Army, the remaining 8 expecting theirs almost any day; in fact, of the 17, some left the school grounds, certificate in hand, to board a bus for the induction center. Not one of the boys seemed to mind; in fact, they seemed happy, even in their immaturity, to serve their country wherever called. But, Mr. Speaker, many an oldster there was more emotionally upset than can be adequately expressed, to think that these youths, just a whisper away from childhood, with a faint down marking where a beard one day will grow, must go direct from the playing fields of prep school to the horrid pit of war.

I remember that once I closed a graduating address delivered at a high school with these lines from Longfellow:

How beautiful is youth! How bright its gleams!

With its allusions, aspirations, dreams;
Book of beginnings, story without end,
Each maid a heroine, and each man a friend,

All possibilities are in its hands.
No danger daunts, and no foe withstands
In its sublime audacity of faith.
Be thou removed, it to the mountain saith,
And with ambitious feet, secure and proud,
Ascends the ladder, leaning on a cloud

But, now that the "brazen throat of war hath roared" the lives of these boys are timed to the throbbing of the drum.

For some of those boys sitting on the stage that bright June morning, whose souls have never known anything more terrible than a bleeding nose at football, instead of ascension on a ladder leaning on a cloud, there may be sleep—the "sleep that knows not breaking morn of toil, nor night of waking."

Oh, the arrant knaves and fools of European statesmen of the last generation, with our assent, to write a clumsy peace that would let this thing come to pass! Imposing and inserting terms and omitting their necessary safeguards that wrung from Marshal Foch the exclamation, "Gentlemen, this is not a peace that you have written; it is only an armistice for 20 years." He missed his prophecy by one year only. And, oh

the ignorance and bigotry and stupidity of the statesmen of our country of that day and era, who refused to permit us to accept our responsibilities in world affairs, and declined to permit of us at least the endeavor to cooperate with other nations to preserve a lasting peace!

Mr. Speaker, I have drawn upon this personal experience of mine many times in discussing the last post-war period—once upon the floor of this House. I trust this repetition at this time will be forgiven. I was fortunate enough to be on detached military service in Paris after the Armistice of World War I, and I saw the Peace Conference in progress. I was privileged to see President Wilson as he moved from group to group assembled there, his face shining with his high ideals and noble purposes of justifying the sacrifice of our war dead by the writing of a just and lasting peace and the setting up of a strong and effective League of Nations, with the active participation of our country, that would have ushered in a new era when nations settled their differences at the council table and not on bloody fields of battle.

One by one his 14 points and his proposals for peace terms were bartered and whittled away by the sly, shrewd, and selfish statesmen of Europe. He could not defend his position because he knew already that doubt and uncertainty pervaded the halls of Congress, and he had no commitment of his legislative bodies, such as this resolution, to strengthen and inspire him. Finally he had nothing left but his plan for the League of Nations. Regardless of the peace terms, he thought just with this simple instrument permanent peace could be insured, surely its acceptance by his people would be unanimous, and he hurried home to lay it before the country. But the Senate would have none of it. "No," said the elder statesmen, "let the souls of the dead, far beyond the last horizon's rim, keep marching for the peace they died to insure. We will have none of your theory of internationalism. We are girt by wide and mighty oceans. We are sufficient unto ourselves. Let the rest of the world attend to its own affairs, and we will attend to ours."

It was my sad privilege later, after this repudiation, to catch one fleeting glimpse of Wilson as he slowly moved about the street near his home in Washington, a pitiable wreck of a paralytic that walked toward an early grave with shuffling step and drooling mouth and staring, vacant eyes.

And I recall seeing, just after his death, a picture drawn by that great cartoonist, Cary Orr, captioned "The Chief Joins His Legions," and it pictured Wilson entering the spirit world, and there, drawn up in review to meet him, were all the hosts of the late American dead, their poor skeletons of bodies standing stiffly at attention; one ghostly figure blew upon a phantom bugle; another raised the phantom colors. For the dead Commander in Chief, whose dream had come to naught, was taking over command of his legions of dead whose death had come to naught.

May God prevent the recurrence of such an episode in our history! The passage of the Fulbright resolution will prevent such an exhibition this time on the part of Congress, and our dead in World War II will not have died in vain; those who, as their comrades return, are destined to forever sleep beyond that last opening in the hills and far across the wide and wildering wastes of oceans, will know that in dying they verily found the dream, ideal, and objective that they so willingly pursued.

Members of my committee bespeak the aid of the House generally in obtaining an early rule for the consideration of the Fulbright resolution.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the House adopted an amendment to the war agencies appropriation bill which in effect would abolish the Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information.

I share, with all Members of this House, a high regard for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], who offered that amendment, and I am sure if that distinguished gentleman, who is one of the most able Members of this body, had considered fully the effect of his amendment he would have altered it somewhat, at least, before offering it.

Most of the debate on the amendment in the Committee of the Whole centered on the so-called propaganda phases of the Domestic Branch of O. W. I. Very little attention was given to the broader effect of the amendment.

During consideration of nearly every appropriation bill for fiscal year 1943 there was a recurring refrain from both sides of the aisle that there be established a central information agency to coordinate and tie together the various news releases and statements of facts and policies emanating from the Government departments, bureaus, and agencies. Not only was there an insistent demand from Congress that a central bureau be established but almost unanimously the press of the Nation was attacking the Government for conflicting statements by various Federal officials on such subjects as rubber, oil, production, prices, manpower, and on down the line.

The public was confused, and there were evidences, rather pronounced, that the public was losing confidence in the accuracy of military news. The charge was being made that the Navy was withholding news of the complete destruction of our fleet at Pearl Harbor, and other charges were made that bad news was withheld until some compensating good news could be released at the same time.

Into that picture of confusion, doubt and uncertainty, came the Office of War Information. In assuming the directorship, Mr. Elmer Davis summed up its basic policy in this sentence:

This is a people's war, and to win it they should know as much about it as they can.

We will tell the people the truth and nothing but the truth. Only information of value to the enemy will be withheld.

Having served in practically every position on the editorial staff of a daily newspaper, I have watched, perhaps with more than ordinary interest, the manner in which that policy has been carried out. I also was one of those who demanded on the floor of the House that a central agency for information be established.

Through the past year the O. W. I. has battled within all the councils of Government for the prompt, complete, and accurate reporting of military news.

It is true that not all of the conflicting statements have disappeared, but most of them have, due to the coordinating work of the O. W. I. Let us look into some of the other effects of this amendment. Radio networks and their affiliated stations along with independent stations are devoting approximately \$100,000,000 in radio time in their desire to cooperate in helping to keep the people who are at war accurately informed on such matters as bond sales, scrap drives, food conservation, and other important matters. The radio industry depends upon O. W. I. to bring all these facts together in their proper proportion and perspective. Without the work of the O. W. I. Domestic Branch the radio industry would have to go back to the 33 different agencies, and then face the task of evaluating information obtained on single subjects rather than having the whole matter tied together in one bundle.

Likewise the advertising industry has made available around \$100,000,000 in advertising space in newspapers and magazines. The advertising council responsible for filling this white space with valuable information for our people depends on O. W. I. to do the same job it does for the radio industry. If it were abolished the Advertising Council likewise would have to fall back on 33 agencies, some of which are in a sense competitive.

Through an agreement worked out with the motion picture industry, the O. W. I. makes 26 pictures during a year, and the industry itself makes 26 others, thus giving a picture a week on some important war topic. All of that is under the Domestic Branch of O. W. I.

Retail stores from coast to coast have been very liberal in making available the use of their windows for posters relating to the war program. Under the present plan one poster each week is released on some subject of timeliness and importance.

Enemy propaganda is constantly flooding the American home front, and O. W. I. is the only agency in the Nation that regularly exposes by the light of fact all the dark lies and fallacies of what the enemy is saying.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a strong tendency in this body to curtail expenses and save the Government and the people money.

The Domestic Branch of O. W. I. costs less than \$9,000,000 per year. By the expenditure of that amount it makes possible the effective service of the free

communication media of America—the press, radio, advertising, motion pictures, and magazines—in doing an effective job, and one, which though done by private effort, costs several hundred million dollars per year.

If the Domestic Branch of O. W. I. were abolished, as provided in the amendment already adopted by the House, the costs of every Federal war agency unquestionably will rise, and even with the increased costs the results are not likely to be nearly so favorable as they have been under the present system.

Charges have been made that the Office of War Information has engaged in political practices. These accusations, it seems to me, can hardly stand the light of careful examination.

The Director himself has warned all officials and employees of the Office that they can no more afford to be concerned with politics than can the Army or the Navy.

The personnel of the Office for the most part is made up of professional people who are concerned only with how they may best present the facts, and the information programs, so far as I have been able to learn, have not dealt in political issues, but with matters entirely related to this global war. It has been pointed out previously that until very recently the Director of the Domestic Branch was Mr. Gardner Cowles, an ardent Republican and a prominent mid-western publisher. Following his resignation, Mr. Palmer Hoyt, another prominent Republican, but a sincere American and a very fine Pacific coast publisher, has left his own newspaper to come here as Director of the Domestic Branch.

I mention the fact that both of these able journalists are Republicans not for the purpose of injecting politics into the discussion but in an effort to show, as I think it does show, that the agency has not been political or partisan either from the standpoint of personnel or policies.

Mr. Speaker, I am not so much concerned about the so-called home-front propaganda activities of the O. W. I. Domestic Branch as I am about the clearance and coordination features of the agency.

The war activities of this Nation and its Government on the home front are exceedingly complex. The daily lives of millions of people in many ways are affected by the decisions of the many agencies charged with carrying out the program.

Such decisions and the subsequent actions taken are of utmost interest and importance to the people they affect, and they are entitled to full and accurate information as quickly as it can be transmitted.

Now, in this complex pattern of Federal activity, several agencies may share responsibility in some measure for the handling of what would seem to be a single problem, such as food, gasoline, or inflation control. Each one of these agencies naturally has a primary interest in its particular phase of the problem. It is only natural if each agency attempted to keep the public informed of its own activities, without any relation

whatsoever to the other parties or agencies doing the same job, conflict and confusion inevitably would result. We saw that happening a year ago and we cried out against it, as rightly we should.

The domestic branch of O. W. I. provides the central clearance facilities which are necessary to give the public an accurate, ungarbled picture of the war activities of the Government as a whole.

The branch has what is known as an inter-agency liaison system through which the news bureau clears all war agency news releases, including speeches and statements by ranking officials thus eliminating, or certainly minimizing, contradictions that might result if statements were made on the basis of the functions of a single agency rather than in relation to what all other agencies are doing.

Just as an example of the extent to which the press of the Nation depends on O. W. I. to gather up loose ends and tie them together, is the fact that newspapers maintain 54 full-time correspondents who make their headquarters in the O. W. I. press room. The news bureau handles an average of 2,500 queries per month from the newspapers of the Nation.

The O. W. I. clears and issues over 250 news releases a week. It serves 1,867 daily newspapers which have a circulation of more than 141,000,000; 1,500 trade papers; 2,300 trade associations; 10,600 weekly papers, and 1,800 foreign language newspapers.

Let us examine very briefly some of the special reports that have been issued from time to time, and which have been used rather extensively by Members of the Congress. Bear in mind that all of these have been issued through the domestic branch of O. W. I.

In October of last year the O. W. I. issued the first clear-cut report on American aircraft. That report, very comprehensive and accurate, did more than any other one thing to end what was developing into a first-class controversy with reference to American planes as compared to those of enemy nations.

On March 26 of this year a report was issued on absenteeism. Many Members of this body referred to that report and quoted from it.

On April 17 of this year the O. W. I. Rubber Report was released. It dealt with a number of matters that were disputed in various quarters, but subsequent developments have proved the accuracy of that report.

Again, in April of this year, the O. W. I., after a careful survey of all transportation facilities and problems, issued a Transportation Report which still is a basic document in the consideration of the transportation problems which daily arise.

Without going into a discussion of other reports, may I simply refer to them as examples of a type of service which no other agency of the Government is equipped to do. Among these are:

Report on Air Transport, issued June 7, 1943; Report on Willow Run, Febru-

ary 14, 1943; Report on Nazi Slave Labor, March 28, 1943; Small Business Under the Axis, March 30, 1943; Food Report, April 15, 1943; Alien Property, May 6, 1943; Recovery of American Wounded, May 19, 1943; Lend-Lease Report, a series released at different times.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the other body, and then in conference, sufficient arrangements may be agreed to that will permit the Domestic Branch of O. W. I. to continue its functions particularly in the field of coordination of news, and of information for the radio, the advertising council, and other private agencies that depend on it for guidance in the preparation of material to aid the war program.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], who had 20 minutes this afternoon to address the House, and found it impossible because of the lateness of the hour to use the special order, I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes next Tuesday after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of the legislative program in order for the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. THOMASON), for 1 day, on account of being a member of the special committee of the House attending a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Ottawa, Canada.

To Mr. LESINSKI, for 1 week, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a magazine article taken from the Virginia Quarterly Review.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 332. An act to revise the Alaska game law;

H. R. 1648. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2397. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2513. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or

in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 217. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect; and

S. 650. An act to revive and reenact the Act entitled "An Act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932.

THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION ACT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2869) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m., tomorrow, Wednesday, June 30, 1943.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10 a. m., Wednesday, June 30, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2596, to protect naval petroleum reserve No. 1, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The special subcommittee on bankruptcy and reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 30, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 30, 1943. Business to be considered: To hear Mr. MacLeod, Office of Price Administration.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

525. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, prepared by the Commissioner of Narcotics, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

526. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his report and recommendation concerning the claim of Pan American Airways, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to the act of April 10, 1928, Forty-fifth Statute 413; to the Committee on Claims.

527. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting the fourth report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended January 31, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 248); to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 139. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; with amendment (Rept. No. 612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 340. A bill to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to grant and convey certain lands to the city of Sitka, Alaska, for street purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 275. Resolution granting consideration of H. R. 2714, the urgent deficiencies appropriations; without amendment (Rept. No. 615). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3026. A bill relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts; with amendment (Rept. No. 616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3066. A bill to amend section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 3469 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3067. A bill to make October 12 a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3068. A bill to amend section 23 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 3069. A bill to provide for improved agricultural land utilization by assisting in

the rehabilitation and construction of drainage works in the humid areas of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 3070. A bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 3071. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. Res. 274. Resolution authorizing an investigation by the Committee on the Public Lands with respect to methods of increasing the production of oil and gas on public lands of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McGRANERY:

H. Res. 276. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate recent charges in the public press that members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps are being furnished contraceptives by the Department of War; to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1775. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from Clint Logan, of Louisville, Ill., director of the Illinois Farmers' Institute, for the Twenty-fourth Congressional District, earnestly opposing the proposed subsidy and rollback in prices on foods for the reason that it would decrease production and would be unfair to the taxpayers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1776. By Mr. HOPE: Petition favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1777. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of Thomas E. Keigher and 98 other citizens of Schenectady and Scotia, N. Y., appealing for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1778. By Mr. MAGNUSON: Petition favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1779. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of the San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council, proposing that allotments to aged mothers and fathers be increased to that being paid wives, and that Congress review the entire system of allotments to the end that a decent standard of living can be maintained by the fathers, mothers, and wives of the men fighting the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1780. Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, regarding the serious housing problem and urging that 5,000 moderately priced family dwellings for war workers be built within the city and county of San Francisco, and that the Honorable John M. Blandford, National Housing Administrator, be urged to act favorably on such request; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

1781. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Kurt Mertig, of New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to Executive Order No. 9066; to the Committee on the Judiciary.